









THE

WESTMINSTER

REVIEW



JULY AND OCTOBER,

1872.

---

"Truth can never be confirm'd enough,  
Though doubts did ever sleep."

SHAKESPEARE.

Wahrheitsliebe zeigt sich darin, daß man überall das Gute zu finden und zu schätzen weiß.  
GÖTTE.

---

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XLII.

LONDON:

TRÜBNER & CO., 8 & 60, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

MDCCCLXXII.

LONDON:

SAVILL, EDWARDS AND CO, PRINTERS, CHANCERY STREET,  
COVENT GARDEN.

# CONTENTS.

---

ART.

PAGE

## I. *Greek Tragedy and Euripides.*

1. Euripides. With an English Commentary. By F. A. PALEY.  
3 Vols. ("Bibliotheca Classica.") 1858-60.
2. God in History ; or, the Progress of Man's Faith. By Baron  
BUNSEN. Translated from the German by SUSANNAH  
WINKWORTH. 3 Vols. 8vo. London. 1868-70.
3. Balaustion's Adventure. By ROBERT BROWNING. 1871. . 1

## II. *The Geographical Distribution of Animals and Plants, Geologically considered.*

1. The Geographical Distribution of Mammals. By ANDREW  
MURRAY. London. 1866.
2. The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the  
Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life.  
By CHARLES DARWIN, M.A., F.R.S., &c. Second Edition.  
London. 1860.
3. The Descent of Man, and Selection in relation to Sex. By  
CHARLES DARWIN, M.A., F.R.S., &c. 2 Vols. London.  
1871.
4. The Malayan Archipelago. By ALFRED WALLACE, F.L.S.,  
&c. 2 Vols. London. 1869.
5. Contributions to the Theory of Natural Selection. By  
ALFRED WALLACE, F.L.S. London. 1870.
6. The Naturalist on the Amazons. By HENRY BATES. 2 Vols.  
London. 1863.
7. The Student's Flora of the British Islands. By Dr. HOOKER,  
F.R.S. London. 1870.
8. Migrations Vegetales, in "Revue des Deux Mondes." By  
M. MARTINS. 1870.
9. Recherches sur le climat et la végétation du pays Tertiaire.  
By Professor HEER. Paris. 1861.
10. The Geological Relations of the Existing Fauna and Flora of  
the British Islands. By Professor EDWARD FORBES.  
London. 1846.

ART.	PAGE
11. The Atlantis Hypothesis in its Botanical Aspect. By Professor OLIVER, in "Nat. Hist. Review." 1862.	
12. New Holland in Europe. By Professor UNGER. Translation in Seemann's "Journal of Botany." 1865.	
13. The Principles of Geology. By Sir CHARLES LYELL, Bart., F.R.S., &c. Tenth Edition. 2 Vols. London. 1868 .	28

### III. *The Political Disabilities of Women.*

1. Speech of John Stuart Mill, M.P., on the Admission of Women to the Electoral Franchise. Spoken in the House of Commons, May, 1867.	
2. Speech of Jacob Bright, M.P., on the Electoral Disabilities of Women. Delivered at Edinburgh on January 17, 1870.	
3. On the Forfeiture of Property by Married Women. By ARTHUR HOBHOUSE, Q.C.	
4. The Married Women's Property Act, 1870. Custody of Infants Act, 1 & 3 Vict. cap. 54. Social and Political Dependence of Women. Longmans and Co.	
5. Industrial Employment of Women of the Middle and Lower Ranks. By JOHN DUGUID MILNE, Advocate, Aberdeen. Revised Edition. Longmans, Green, and Co.	
6. Woman's Suffrage Journal. Edited by LYDIA E. BECKER. Vol. II. 1871. Trubner and Co. . . . .	50

### IV. *The First Earl of Shaftesbury.*

A Life of Anthony Ashley Cooper, First Earl of Shaftesbury, 1621-1683. By W. D. CHRISTIE, M.A., formerly Her Majesty's Minister to the Argentine Confederation and to Brazil. 2 Vols. London and New York: Macmillan and Co. 1871 . . . . .	70
---	----

### V. *The Development of Belief.*

1. Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind. By JAMES MILL, edited by J. S. MILL. Vol. I. Chap. XI. "Belief." With Notes by ALEXANDER BAIN and the EDITOR. Longmans. 1869.	
2. The Emotions and the Will. By ALEXANDER BAIN. Part II. Chap. XI. "Belief." Longmans. 1865.	
3. On the Emotion of Conviction. By WALTER BAGEHOT. Contemporary Review, April, 1871. . . . .	121

# Contents.

iii

ART.

PAGE

## VI. *The Government and the Education Act.*

1. An Act to provide for Public Elementary Education in England and Wales. 9th August, 1870.
2. The National Education League Monthly Paper ; Nos. 14-25, January to December, 1871 . . . . . 164

## VII. *Independent Section.*

- A Theory of Wages . . . . . 184

## *Contemporary Literature.*

- Theology and Philosophy . . . . . 204
- Politics, Sociology, Voyages and Travels . . . . . 221
- Science . . . . . 238
- History and Biography . . . . . 257
- Belles Lettres . . . . . 273

*To the Editor of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW.*

SIR,—In the last number of THE WESTMINSTER I find the following sentences :—" We should like to know whether any part of it" (Dr. Ward's fund) " has ever been appropriated to a different purpose from that which Dr. Ward contemplated. Has any part of it ever been absorbed by one of the more prominent Colleges, without any student deriving benefit therefrom?" (p. 432.)

Dr. Ward's Fund is administered under the Charity Commission. The Trustees are well known. And I can affirm that *there is no ground whatever for your Reviewer's question.*

Again:—"A lecturer on divinity in a Baptist College said to his class, after elaborating a cumulative argument against election. When I was a student at Edinburgh, Dr. Brown used a very powerful argument against the Calvinistic theology. But he finished by saying, 'That is the argument; but mind, it is your duty to believe and preach Calvinism'" (p. 438).

I am the only lecturer on divinity in a Baptist College who studied in Edinburgh. I may therefore conclude that your Reviewer refers to me! Every part of his anecdote is a mistake. My cumulative argument did not refer to election, but to what is called restricted atonement. I never named Dr. Brown, but Dr. Hill. His "very powerful argument" is in his book, and was used long before I was in Edinburgh. It is not an "argument," but a selection of Scripture passages. And I mentioned his remark, not to approve it, but to warn students against it, and to congratulate them that they had to take their theology, not from creeds, but from the Bible.

The above corrections I ask you to insert in fairness and on personal grounds.

Yours very truly,

JOSEPH ANGUS.

*College, Regent's Park, Nov. 27th, 1871.*

\* \* \* We are glad to receive Dr. Angus's assurance that there is no ground whatever for our question concerning the administration of Dr. Ward's Fund.

Respecting the "anecdote," the truth of which Dr. Angus denies, the evidence is certainly conflicting; but, while giving him an opportunity of publishing his own version of it, we must observe that the relator of the anecdote affirms that he himself heard what he relates, and adheres to his own version of the story, Dr. Angus's contradiction notwithstanding.—ED. W. R.

# CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE
I. <i>Trial by Judge, and Trial by Jury</i> . . . . .	289
II. <i>The Political Reconstruction of Germany.</i>	
1. Die Verfassung des deutschen Reiches mit der Verfassung des Norddeutschen Bundes Zusammengestellt. Von Dr. STOCKMANN. Leipzig. 1871.	
2. Die Verfassung des deutschen Reiches in den Grundzügen und Verhältnissen zu den Einzelstaaten. Von LORENZ HAUSER. Nördlingen. 1871.	
3. Das neue deutsche Reich und seine Verfassung. Von Dr. LEOPOLD AUERBACH. Berlin. 1871.	
4. L'Allemagne politique depuis la paix de Prague. VICTOR CHERBULIEZ. Paris. 1871. . . . .	324
III. <i>The University College of Wales.</i>	
1. A University for Wales, No. 1. 1864.	
2 Report of the Welsh Education Conference at Aberystwyth. 1870.	
3. The "Aberystwyth Observer," "Wrexham Advertiser," and "Wrexham Guardian." 1869-71.	
4. Report on the University. 1871.	
5. Outline of the Proposed Constitution of the University College of Wales. 1872. . . . .	345
IV. <i>India : The Musalman Panic.</i>	
Our Indian Musalmans : Are they bound in Conscience to Rebel against the Queen? By W. W. HUNTER, LL.D., of Her Majesty's Bengal Civil Service. London : Trübner and Co. 1871 . . . . .	359
V. <i>Christian Theology and Modern Scepticism.</i>	
Christian Theology and Modern Scepticism. By the DUKE OF SOMERSET. London. 1872. . . . .	380
VI. <i>Napoleon the First : The Man.</i>	
Histoire de Napoléon Ier. Par M. LANFREY. Paris. 1870. . . . .	399



ART.	PAGE
VII. <i>The Migration of Labour</i> . . . . .	417
VIII. <i>The Question of Race in France.</i>	
1. Mémoires de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris. Tomes i. ii. Paris. 1860-5.	
2. Bulletins de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris. I. Série, Tomes i.-vi. ; II. Série, i.-iv. Paris. .	
3. Ethnogenie Gauloise. Par ROGET BON DE BELLOQUET. Tomes i. ii. Paris. 1861.	
4. Histoire de la Langue Française. Par E. LITTRE. Tomes i. ii. Paris. 1869. . . . .	434
IX. <i>Spiritualism and its Evidences.</i>	
Hints for the Evidences of Spiritualism. By M.P. London Trübner and Co., 60, Paternoster Row. 1872. . . . .	461
X. <i>The Distribution of Representation.</i>	
1. Preliminary Report and Tables of the Population, and Houses Enumerated, in England and Wales, on 3rd April, 1871.	
2. Return of the Number of Electors on the Parliamentary Register of the United Kingdom. 1872.	
3. Report of the Boundary Commissioners. 1868. . . . .	469
<i>Contemporary Literature.</i>	
Theology and Philosophy . . . . .	494
Politics, Sociology, Voyages and Travels . . . . .	519
Science . . . . .	538
History and Biography . . . . .	556
Belles Lettres . . . . .	571

THE  
WESTMINSTER  
AND  
FOREIGN QUARTERLY  
REVIEW.

JANUARY 1, 1872.

ART. I.—GREEK TRAGEDY AND EURIPIDES.

1. *Euripides. With an English Commentary.* By F. A. PALEY. 3 Vols. ("Bibliotheca Classica.") 1858-60.
2. *God in History; or, the Progress of Man's Faith.* By Baron BUNSEN. Translated from the German by SUSANNAH WINKWORTH. 3 Vols. 8vo. London: 1868-70.
3. *Balaustion's Adventure.* By ROBERT BROWNING. 1871.

**C**RITICS who are contented with referring the origin of the Greek Drama to the mimetic instinct inherent in humanity are apt to neglect those circumstances which render it an almost unique phenomenon in literature. If the mimetic instinct were all that is requisite for the origination of a national drama, then we should find that every race at a certain period of its development produced both tragedy and comedy. This, however, is far from being the case. A certain rude mimesis, such as the acting of descriptive dances or the jesting of buffoons and mummers, is indeed common in all ages and nations. But there are only two races which can be said to have produced the drama as a fine art originally and independently of foreign influences. These are the Greeks and the Hindhus. With reference to the Hindhus, it is even questionable whether they would have composed plays so perfect as their famous "Sakountala" without contact with the Hellenes. All the products of the modern drama, whether tragic or comic, must be regarded as the direct progeny of the Greek stage. The habit of play-acting, continued from Athens to Alexandria, and from Rome to Byzantium, never wholly expired. The "Christus Patiens," at

[Vol. XCVII. No. CXCL.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. XLI. No. I.      B

tributed to Gregory of Nazianzum, was an adaptation of the art of Euripides to Christian story; and the representation of "Mysteries" during the middle ages, kept alive the dramatic tradition, until the discovery of classic literature and the revival of taste in modern Europe led to the great works of the English, Spanish, French, and subsequently of the German theatre.

Something more than the mere instinct of imitation therefore, caused the Greeks to develop their drama. Like sculpture, like the epic, the drama was one of the artistic forms through which the genius of the Greek race expressed itself—by which, to use the language of philosophical mysticism, it fulfilled its destiny as a prime agent in the manifestation of the World-Spirit. In their realization of that perfect work of art for which they seem to have been specially ordained, the drama was no less requisite than sculpture and architecture, than the epic, the ode, and the idyll.

Two conditions, both of which the Greeks enjoyed in great perfection at the moment of their first dramatic energy, seem to be requisite for the production of a great and thoroughly national drama: These are, first an era of intense activity, or a period succeeding immediately to one of excitement, by which the nation has been nobly agitated; secondly, a public worthy of the dramatist, spurring him on by its enthusiasm and intelligence to the creation of high works of art. A glance at the history of the drama in modern times will prove how necessary these conditions are. It was the gigantic effort which we English people made in our struggle with Rome and Spain, it was the rousing of our keenest thought and profoundest emotion by the Reformation, which prepared us for the Elizabethan drama—by far the greatest, next to the Greek, in literature. The nation lived in action, and delighted to see great actions imitated. Races in repose or servitude, like the Hebrews under the Roman Empire, may in their state of spiritual exaltation and by effort of pondering on the mysteries of God and man, give birth to new theosophies; but it requires a free and active race, in which young and turbulent blood is flowing, to produce a drama. In England, again, at that time, there was a great public. All classes crowded to the theatres. London, in whose streets and squares martyrs had been burned, on whose quays the pioneers of the Atlantic and Pacific, after disputing the Indies with Spain, lounged and enjoyed their leisure, supplied an eager audience, delighting in the dreams of poets which recalled to mind the realities of their own lives, appreciating the passion of tragedy, enjoying the mirth of comic incident. The men who listened to "Othello" had both done and suffered largely; their own experience was mirrored in the scenes of blood and struggle

set before them. These two things, therefore—the awakening of the whole English nation to activity, and the presence of a free and haughty audience, made our drama great.

In the Spanish drama only one of the requisite conditions was fulfilled—activity. Before they began to write plays the Spaniards had expelled the Moors, discovered the New World, and raised themselves to the first place among European nations. But there was not the same free audience in Spain as in England. Papal despotism and the tyranny of the Court checked and coerced the drama, so that with all its richness and imaginative splendour the Spanish theatre is inferior to the English. The French drama suffered still more from the same kind of restriction. Subject to the canons of scholastic pedants, tied down to an imitation of the antique, made to reflect the manners and sentiments of a highly artificial Court, animated by the sympathies of no large national audience, the French playwrights became courtiers, artists obedient to the pleasures of a king—not, like the dramatists of Greece and England, the prophets of the people, the leaders of a Chorus triumphant and rejoicing in its mighty deeds.

Italy has no real theatre. In Italy there has been no stirring of a national, united spirit; no supreme and central audience; no sudden consciousness of innate force and freedom in the sovereign people. The requisite conditions have always failed. The German drama, both by its successes and shortcomings, illustrates the same position. Such greatness as it achieved in Goethe and Schiller it owed to the fermentation of German nationality, to the so-called period of “storm and stress” which electrified the intellects of Germany and made the Germans eager to assert their manhood among nations. But listen to Goethe complaining that there was no public to receive his works; study the petty cabals of Weimar; estimate the imitative and laborious spirit of German art; and it is clear why Germany produced but scattered and imperfect results in the drama.

The examples of England, Spain, France, Italy, Germany, all tend to prove that for the creation of a drama it is necessary that the condition of national activity should be combined with the condition of a national audience—not an audience of courtiers, or critics, or learned persons. In Greece both of these conditions were united in unrivalled and absolute perfection. While in England, during the Elizabethan period, the public which crowded our theatres were uncultivated, and formed but a small portion of the free nation they represented, in Athens the whole people, collectively and in a body, witnessed the dramatic shows provided for them in the theatre of Bacchus. That theatre had space for 30,000 spectators, so that the total male

population of Athens could enter it and at the same moment attend to the tragedies or comedies of rival playwrights. The same set of men, when assembled in the Pnyx, constituted the national assembly, and in that capacity made laws, voted supplies, declared wars, ratified alliances, ruled the affairs of dependent cities. In a word, they were Athens. Every man among them, by intercourse with the greatest spirits of the Greek world in the Agora and porches of the wrestling-grounds, by contemplation of the sculptures of Phidias, by familiarity with Eleusian processions, by participation in solemn sacrifices and choric dances, by listening to the recitations of Homer, by attendance on the lectures of the sophists, by debates in the Ecclesia, by pleadings in the law-courts, had been multifariously educated and rendered capable of appreciating the subtleties of rhetoric and argument, as well as of comprehending the æsthetical beauty with which a Greek play was enriched. It is easy to imagine the influence which this potent, multitudinous, and highly cultivated audience must have exercised over the dramatists, and what an impulse it must have communicated to their genius. In England the playwright and the actor were both looked down upon with pity or contempt; they wrote and acted for money in private speculations, and in rivalry with several petty theatres. In Athens the tragedian was honoured. Sophocles was elected a general with Pericles, and a member of the provisional government after the dissolution of the old democracy. The actor too was respected. The State itself defrayed the expenses of the drama, and no ignoble competition was possible between tragedian and tragedian, since all exhibited their plays to the same audience, in the same sacred theatre, and all were judged by the same judges.

The critical condition of the Greek people itself at the epoch of the drama, is worth minute consideration. During the two previous centuries, the whole of Hellas had received a long and careful education: at their conclusion came the terrible convulsion of the Persian war. After the decay of the old monarchies, the Greek states seethed for years in the process of dissolution and reconstruction. The colonies had been founded. The aristocratic families had striven with the mob in every city; and from one or the other power at times tyrants had arisen to control both parties and oppress the commonwealth. Out of these political disturbances there gradually arose a sense of law, a desire for established constitutions. There emerged at last the prospect of political and social stability. Meanwhile, in all departments of art and literature the Greeks had been developing their genius. Lyrical, satirical, and elegiac poetry had been carried to perfection. The Gnomic poets and the Seven Sages

had crystallized morality in apophthegms. Philosophy had taken root in the colonies. Sculpture had almost reached its highest point. The Greek games, practised through nearly three hundred years, had created a sense of national unity. It seemed as if all the acquirements and achievements of the race had been spread abroad to form a solid and substantial base for some most comprehensive superstructure. Then, while Hellas was at this point of magnificent but still incomplete development, there followed, first, the expulsion of the Pisistratids from Athens, which aroused the spirit of that mighty nation, and then the invasion of Xerxes, which electrified the whole Greek world. It was this that inflamed the genius of Greece; this transformed the race of thinkers, poets, artists, statesmen into a race of heroes, actors in the noblest sense of the word. The struggle with Persia, too, gave to Athens her right place. Assuming the Hegemony of Hellas, to which she was foredestined by her spiritual superiority, she flashed in the supreme moment which followed the battle of Salamis into the full consciousness of her own greatness. It was now, when the Persian war had made the Greeks a nation of soldiers, and had placed the crown on Athens, that the drama—that form of art which combines all kinds of poetry in one, which subordinates sculpture, painting, architecture, music, dancing, to its own use, and renders all arts subservient to the one end of action—appeared in its colossal majesty upon the Attic stage.

At this point of history the drama was a necessary product. The forces which had given birth to all the other forms of art were still exuberant and unexhausted, needing their completion. At the same time, nothing but the impassioned presentation of humanity in action could possibly have satisfied the men who had themselves enacted on the plains and straits of Attica the greatest and most artistic drama of real history. It was one of the chief actors of Marathon and Salamis who composed the Prometheus, and represented his own hero on the stage.

If we proceed to analyse the cardinal idea of Greek tragedy, we shall again observe the close connexion which exists between the drama and the circumstances of the people at the time of its production. Schlegel, in his "*Lectures on the Drama*," defines the prevailing idea of Greek tragedy to be the sense of an oppressive destiny—a fate against which the will of man blindly and vainly dashes. This conception of destiny seems to be strongly illustrated by many plays. Orestes, Cedipus, Antigone are unable to escape their doom. Beautiful human heroism and exquisite innocence are alike sacrificed to the fatality attending an accursed house. Yet Schlegel has not gone far enough in his analysis. He has not seen that this inflexible fate is set in motion by a superior and anterior power, that it operates in

the service of offended justice. When Œdipus slays his father, he does so in contempt of oracular warnings. Orestes, haunted by the Furies, has a mother's blood upon his hands, and unexpiated crimes of father and of grandsire to atone for. Antigone, the best of daughters and most loving of sisters, dies miserably, not dogged by fate, but having of her own freewill exposed her life in obedience to the pure laws of the heart. It is impossible to suppose that a Greek would have been satisfied with the bald fate-theory of Schlegel. Not Fate, but Nemesis, was the ruling notion in Greek tragedy. A profound sense of the Divine government of the world, of a righteous power punishing pride and vice, pursuing the children of the guilty to the tenth generation—in short, a mysterious and almost Jewish ideal of Holiness, pervades the whole work of the tragedians. This religious conception had gradually defined itself in the consciousness of the Greek race. Homer in both his epics presents us with the spectacle of crime punished. It is the sin of Paris and the obstinacy of the Trojan princes which leads to the fall of Troy. It is the insolence of the suitors in the "Odyssey" which brings them to their death. The Cyclical poets seem to have dwelt on the same theme. The storm which fell on the Achaian fleet, dispersing or drowning the heroes, was a punishment for their impiety and pride during the sack of Troy. The madness of Ajax followed his violence upon Cassandra. When conscious morality begins in Greece, the idea is at once made prominent. Hesiod continually insists on justice, whose law no man may violate unpunished. The Gnostic poets show how guilt, if unavenged at the moment, brings calamity upon the offspring of the evil-doer. This notion of an inheritance of crime is particularly noticeable; since it tinged the whole tragedy of the Greeks. Solon, again, in his dialogue with Cræsus, developes another aspect of the same idea. With him the Deity is jealous of all towering greatness, of all insolent prosperity; his Nemesis punishes the pride of wealth and the lust of life. Some of the most prominent personages of Greek tragedy—Creon, Œdipus, Theseus, Agamemnon—illustrate this phase of the idea. In the sayings of the Seven Sages we trace another shade of the conception. All of them insist on moderation, modesty, the right proportion, the due mean. The lyrists take up a somewhat different position. The vicissitudes of life, both independent of and connected with personal guilt, fascinate their imagination. They have a deep and awful sense of sudden catastrophes. Pindar rises to a loftier level: his odes are pervaded by reverence for a holy Power, before whom the insolent are forced to bow, by whom the humble are protected, and the good rewarded.

Such are the traces of a doctrine of Nemesis to be found in all

the literature of the pre-dramatic period. That very event which determined the sudden splendour of the drama, gave a sublime and terrific sanction to the already existing morality. The Persian war exhibited the downfall of a haughty and insolent race, cut off in all its pomp and power. Before the eyes of the men who witnessed the calamities of *Oedipus* and *Agamemnon* on the stage, the glory of godless Asia had vanished like a dream. Thus the idea of *Nemesis* quelling the insolent and smiting the unholy, was realized in actual history; and to add to the impression produced on Greek imagination by the destruction of the Persian hosts, *Phidias* carved his statue of *Nemesis* to be a monument in enduring marble of the national morality. *Æschylus* erected an even more majestic monument to the same principle in his tragedies.

*Nemesis* is the fundamental idea of the Greek drama. It appears strongest in *Æschylus*, as a prophetic and awful law, mysteriously felt and terribly revealed. *Sophocles* uses it to point the deep moralities which govern human life. In *Euripides* it degenerates into something more akin to a sense of vicissitudes; it becomes more sentimental—less a religious or moral principle than a phenomenon inspiring fear and pity. This sequence appears to us necessary in the growth and expansion of a primitive idea. Rugged and superstitious at first, it becomes harmonized and humanized, and ends in being merely artistic.

In considering the work done by the three great tragic authors, we must not forget that the Greek dramatists adhered to a fixed body of legends; the tales of the House of *Atreus*, of *Troy*, of the family of *Laius* at *Thebes*, of *Herakles*, of *Jason*, and of *Theseus*, formed the staple of the plays of *Æschylus*, *Sophocles*, and *Euripides*. This fact helps to account for the early decline of the Greek drama. It was impossible for the successors of *Æschylus* and *Sophocles* to surpass them in the treatment of the same mythical motives. Yet custom and tradition, the religious antecedents of tragedy, the cumbrous apparatus of mask and buskin and *Bacchic robe*, the conventional *Chorus*, the vast size of the theatre, the whole form, in fact, of Greek dramatic art, rendered a transition from the heroic to the romantic tragedy impossible. Those fixed legends which *Æschylus* had used as the framework for his religious philosophy of *Nemesis* and *Ate*, from which *Sophocles* had drawn deep lessons of morality, had to be employed by *Euripides* as best he might. On their firmly traced, inflexible outlines he embroidered his own work of pathos and imagination, losing sight of the divine element, blurring morality, but producing a world of fanciful yet living shapes of sentiment and thought and passion.

In order to comprehend the position of *Euripides* in relation



to his predecessors, we must consider the changes which had taken place in Athens between the period of the Persian war and that in which he flourished. All the mutations of Greek history were accomplished with celerity; but in this space of less than half a century the rate of progress was nothing less than marvellous. Some of the men of Marathon yet remained when Aristophanes was writing, both to point his moral against Euripides, and also to prove by contrast with the generation that had grown up since, how impossible it was for the poet of the present to vie with the Æschylus of the past. In the first place Athens had become the centre of progressive thought. Teachers of rhetoric and reasoning made her wrestling grounds and gardens the scene of their disputes and lectures. The arts of eloquence were studied by the youth who in a previous age had been contented with Homer. At Athens, Anaxagoras had questioned the divinity of Helios, and had asserted Reason to be the moving force of the universe. Sophists who taught the arts of life for money; philosophers who subjected morals to ingenious analysis, and explained away on scientific principles the old myths of Greek nature-worship, combined to disturb ethical and religious traditions. A more solid, because more reasoned, morality was springing up perhaps. A purer monotheism was being inculcated. But meanwhile the old Hellenic customs and the fabric of mythic theology were undermined. It could not be but that the poet of the day should participate in these changes. In the second place, the Athenian populace had grown to be supreme in two departments: the high parliament of State and the law-courts. Every Athenian was now far more than formerly an orator or judge of orators, an advocate or judge of advocates. Two passions possessed the popular mind: the passion for the Assembly with its stormy debate and pompous declamation; the passion for the Dikastery with its personal interests, its problems of casuistical law, its momentous tragedies of private life, its studied eloquence. Talking and listening were the double function of an Athenian citizen. To speak well on every subject, so as to gain causes in the courts, and to persuade the people in the Pnyx; to criticise speeches with acumen, so as not to be deluded by specious arguments: these were the prime accomplishments of an Athenian youth of promise. It is obvious that a very peculiar audience was thus formed for the tragedian—an audience greedy of intellectual subtleties, of pathetic situations, of splendid oratory, of clever reasoning—an audience more appreciative of the striking than the true, of the novel than the natural. In the third place, the Athenians had waxed delicate and wanton since the Persian war. When Æschylus

began to write, the peril of utter ruin hung like a stone of Tantalus over Hellas. That removed, the Greeks breathed freely. The Athenians, growing in wealth and power, neglected the old moderation of their ancestors. Youths who in earlier days would have fared hardly, now drove their chariots, backed their fighting-cocks, and followed their own sweet will. Aristotle quaintly enough observes, that the flute had become fashionable after the expulsion of the Persians. The poet of the day could no longer be austere like *Æschylus* or sedate like *Sophocles*. In all these changes *Euripides* partook. The pupil in rhetoric of *Prodicus*, in philosophy of *Anaxagoras* and *Heraclitus*, a book-collector, a student of painting, the friend of *Socrates*, cultivated in all innovations of morality and creed, *Euripides* belonged essentially to his own day. As far as a tragic dramatist can be the mouthpiece of his age, *Euripides* was the mouthpiece of Athenian decline. For this reason, because he so exactly expressed the feelings and opinions of his time, which feelings and opinions produced a permanent national habit of mind, *Euripides* became the darling of posterity. *Æschylus* was the Titanic product of a bygone period; *Sophocles* displayed the pure and perfect ideal; but *Euripides* was the artist who, without improving on the spirit of his age, gave it a true and adequate expression. The only wonder is that during his lifetime *Euripides* was not more popular at Athens. His comparative neglect proves him to have been somewhat in advance of his century, and justifies *Aristophanes* in the reproach that he anticipated the Athenians in the break-up of their forms of thought.

At this point we may consider the condition of the Tragic Art when *Euripides* took it up as the business of his life. Though tragedy, as formed by *Æschylus*, represented one true and important aspect of Greek thought—the religious, yet it could never have been adequate to the life of the whole nation in the same degree as the many-sided drama of *Shakspeare*, for example, was to that of our Elizabethan ancestors. Its regularity and solemnity tended to make it an ideal work of art. It might arouse the religious feeling, the national pride, the enthusiasm for a legendary past, which were so powerful among the Athenians of the Marathonian epoch. But it could not have had much attraction for the Athenians of the Syracusan expedition. As men subject to the divine rule, indeed, it had a message for them. But as Athenians of to-day it did not touch them. We can well believe that this lofty, ceremonious art fatigued a large portion of the Attic audience. After having listened to some seventy plays of *Æschylus*, and fifty of *Sophocles*, not to mention *Phrynichus* and *Choerilus*, and scores of minor dramatists,

all teaching the same religious morality, and all obeying the same æsthetic principles, we can conceive that a merry Greek became a little bored. It must have required the supreme genius of a Sophocles to sustain the attention of the audience at its ancient altitude. In the hands of inferior poets the tragic common-places must have been insipid. Some change seemed absolutely necessary. Euripides, a poet of very distinguished originality, saw that he must adapt his dramatic style to the new requirements of his audience, and give them what they liked, even though it were not good for them. The sophistic arguments, the strained situations, the law-court pleadings, the pathetic touches, the meretricious lyrics, the philosophical explanations, the sententious epigrams, the theatrical effects, which mar his tragedies, were necessary innovations on the old pure style. Euripides had determined to bring tragedy home to the sympathies of the spectators. All the peculiarities of his art flow from this one aim. Whether he did not pursue this aim on a false method, whether he might not have aroused the sympathies of his audience without debasing tragedy to common life, remains a fit matter for debate.

Entirely to eliminate the idea of Nemesis, which gave its character to Greek tragedy, was what Euripides, had he been so inclined, could hardly have succeeded in effecting. Though he never impresses on our minds the dogma of an avenging deity, like Æschylus, or of an inevitable law, like Sophocles, he makes us feel the chance and change of human life, the helplessness of man, the stormy sea of passions, sorrows, and vicissitudes on which the soul is tossed. Conventional phrases about moderation in all things, retributive justice, and the like, are used to keep up the old tragic form. In this way he brought tragedy down to the level of real life, wherein we do not trace the visible finger of Providence, but where all seems at least confusion to the natural eye. Euripides, no more than Shakspeare, sought to be a prophet or interpreter of the divine operations. In the same spirit he treated his materials with freedom. Adhering conventionally, and as a form of art, to the mythical legends of Hellas—that charmed circle beyond which the tragic muse had never strayed—he adapted them to his own purposes. He gave new characters to the principal heroes, mixed up legendary incidents with trivial domestic scenes, lowered the language of demigods to current Greek talk, hazarded occasional scepticism, and introduced familiar phrases. The sacred character of the myths disappeared; Euripides used them as so many masses of entertaining folk-lore and fiction, fit for tragic handling. When we hear Achilles and Orestes talking like Athenian citizens, wrangling, perorating, subtilizing, seeking victory in strife of words, trifling with questions of profoundest import, and settling moral

problems by verbal quibbles, we understand the remark of Sophocles that he had painted men as they ought to be, Euripides as they are. Medea and Alcestis are not the mythical Medea or the legendary queen of Phææ, but an injured wife, and a devoted wife, just such as Shakspeare or Balzac might have depicted. But unfortunately for this attempt to make Greek tragedy more real and living, more representative of the actual world, the cothurnus, the mask, the Chorus, the thymele, the gigantic stage, remained. All the cumbrous paraphernalia of the Æschylean theatre environed the men and women of Euripides, who cut but a poor figure in the garb of demigods. In trying to adapt the mould of Greek tragedy to real life, Euripides overpassed the limits of possibility. The mould snapped in his hands. Therefore he is better to read than he could have been in scenic representation.

The same inevitable divergence from the Æschylean system is observable in every department of the tragedy of Euripides. While Sophocles had diminished the direct interposition of mysterious agencies, so frequently invoked by Æschylus, and had interested his audience in human character controlled and tempered by an unseen will of God, Euripides went further. With him the affairs of life are no longer based upon a firm foundation of Divine law, but gods intervene mechanically and freakishly, like the magicians in Ariosto or Tasso.\* Their agency is valuable, not as determining the moral conduct of the personages, but as supernatural powers which bring about a sudden revolution of events. Independently of their miraculous activity, the human agents display all varieties of character: every shade of virtue and vice is delicately portrayed; pathetic scenes are multiplied; the tendernesses of domestic life are brought prominently forward; mixed motives and conflicting passions are skilfully analyzed. Consequently the plays of Euripides are more rich in stirring incidents than those of his predecessors. What we lose in gravity and unity is made up for by versatility. Euripides, to use a modern phrase, is more sensational than either Æschylus or Sophocles. Aristotle called him *τραγικώτατος*, by which he probably meant that he was most profuse of touching and exciting scenes.

\* The same tendencies strike us in the more formal department of the tragic art. Here as elsewhere Euripides moves a step beyond Sophocles, breaking the perfection of poetic harmony for the sake of novelty and effect. Euripides condescended to stage tricks. It is well known how Aristophanes laughed at him for

---

\* Exception must be made in favour of the "Hippolytus" and the "Bacchæ," where the whole action of the play and the conduct of the persons are determined by the influences of Aphrodite and Dionysos.

the presentation of shabby-genteel princes and monarchs out-at-elbow. Having no deep tragic destiny for the groundwork of his drama, he sought to touch the spectators by royalty in ruins and wealth reduced to beggary. The gorgeous scenic shows in which Æschylus had delighted, but which he had invariably subordinated to his subject, and which Sophocles with the tact of a supreme master in beauty had managed to dispense with, were lavished by Euripides. One play of his, the "Troades," has absolutely no plot. Such attraction as it possesses it owes to the rapid succession of pathetic situations and splendid scenes, the whole closing with the burning of the towers of Troy.

By curtailing the function of the Chorus, Euripides separated from the action of the drama that element which in Æschylus had been chiefly useful for the inculcation of the moral of the play. On the other hand, by expanding the function of the Messenger he was able to indulge his faculty for brilliant description. It has been well said, that the ear and not the eye was the chosen vehicle of pathos to the Greeks. This remark is fully justified by the narrative passages in the plays of Euripides—passages of poetry unsurpassed for radiance, swiftness, strength, pictorial effect. The account of the Bacchic revels among the mountains of Cithæron, and of the death of Pentheus in the "Bacchæ," that of the death of Glauké in "Medea," and of Hippolytus in the play that bears his name, that of the sacrifice of Polyxena in the "Hecuba," and many others, prove with what consummate skill the third of the great tragic poets seized upon a field within the legitimate province of his art, as yet but imperfectly occupied by his predecessors.

Another novelty was the use of the prologue. Here, again, Euripides expanded the already existing elements in Greek tragedy beyond their power of enduring the strain he put on them. In their drama the Greek poets did not aim at surprise: the spectators were expected to be familiar beforehand with the subject of the play. But when the plot became more complicated, and the incidents more varied under the hands of Euripides, a prologue was the natural expedient, in perfect harmony with the stationary character of Greek tragedy, for placing the audience at the point of view intended by the poet.

In all these changes it will be evident that Euripides, wisely or unwisely, obtained originality by carrying his art beyond the point which it had reached under his predecessors. Using a simile, we might compare the drama of Æschylus to the sublime but rugged architecture which is called Norman, that of Sophocles to the most refined and perfect pointed style, that of Euripides to a highly decorated—florid and flamboyant—manner. Æschylus aimed at durability of structure, at singleness

and grandeur of effect. Sophocles added the utmost elegance and finish. Euripides neglected force of construction and unity of design for ornament and brilliancy of effect. But he added something of his own, something infinitely precious and enduringly attractive. The fault of his style consisted in a too exclusive attention to the parts.

The object of the foregoing remarks has been to show how and to what extent Euripides departed from the form and essence of Greek tragedy. It may sound paradoxical now to assert that it was a merit in him rather than a defect to have sacrificed the unity of art to the development of subordinate beauties. Yet it seems to us that in no other way could the successor of *Æschylus* and *Sophocles* have made himself the true exponent of his age, have expanded to the full the faculties still latent in Greek tragedy, or have failed to "affect the fame of an imitator." The law of inevitable progression in art, from the severe and animated embodiment of an idea to the conscious elaboration of merely æsthetic motives and brilliant episodes, has hitherto been neglected by the critics and historians of poetry. They do not observe that the first impulse in a people toward creativeness is some deep and serious emotion, some fixed point of religious enthusiasm, or national pride. To give adequate form to this taxes the energies of the first generation of artists, and raises their poetic faculty by the admixture of prophetic inspiration to the highest pitch. After the original passion for the ideas to be embodied in art has somewhat subsided, but before the glow and fire of enthusiasm have faded out, there comes a second period, when art is studied more for art's sake, but when the generative potency of the earlier poets is by no means exhausted. For a moment the artist at this juncture is priest, prophet, hierophant, and charmer, all in one. More conscious of the laws of beauty than his predecessors, he makes some sacrifice of the idea to meet the requirements of pure art: but he never forgets that beauty by itself is insufficient to a great and perfect work, nor has he lost his interest in the cardinal conceptions which vitalize the most majestic poetry. During the first and second phases which we have indicated, the genius of a nation throws out a number of masterpieces—some of them rough-hewn and Cyclopean, others perfect in their combination of the strength of thought with grace and elevated beauty. But the mine of ideas is exhausted. The national taste has been educated. Conceptions which were novel to the grandparents have become the intellectual atmosphere of the grandchildren. It is now impossible to return upon the past—to gild the refined gold, or to paint the lily of the supreme poets. Their vigour may survive

in their successors ; but their inspiration has taken form for ever in their poems. What then remains for the third generation of artists ? They have either to reproduce their models—and this is stifling to true genius ; or they have to seek novelty at the risk of impairing the strength or the beauty which has become stereotyped. Less deeply interested in the great ideas by which they have been educated, and of which they are in no sense the creators, incapable of competing on the old ground with their elders, they are obliged to go afield for striking situations, to force sentiment and pathos, to subordinate the harmony of the whole to the melody of the parts, to sink the prophet in the poet, the hierophant in the charmer.

This law of sequence is widely applicable. It will be seen to control the history of all uninterrupted artistic dynasties. Greek sculpture, for example, passes from the austere, through the perfect, to the simply elegant. The artist of the Æginetan pediment was wholly intent upon the faithful representation of heroic incident. The event filled his mind : he sought to express it as energetically as he could. Phidias stands on the ground of accomplished art. The *Mythus* selected for treatment is developed with perfect fidelity, but also with a regard to æsthetical effect. Praxiteles neglects the event, the *Mythus*. His interest in that has languished, and has been supplanted by enthusiasm for pure forms of beauty. He lavishes a Phidian wealth of genius on separate figures and situations of no great import except for their consummate loveliness. In architecture, the genealogy of the Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian orders points to the same law. Take another instance from modern painting. Giotto, Raphael, Correggio, differ less perhaps in actual calibre than in relative historical position. Giotto, intent upon the fundamental ideas of Christian mythology, determines to express them forcibly, faithfully, earnestly, without a side-glance at aught but the best method of investing them with harmony, lucidity, and dignity. Raphael ascends a step, and combines the strength and purity of Giotto with elaborate beauty and classic finish of style. Correggio at his appearance finds all the great work done. The Christian *mythus* has been adequately set forth by his predecessors. He is driven to become the thaumaturgist of *chiaroscuro*, the audacious violator of unity in composition, the supreme painter of erotic paradise. Further development of the religious idea beyond that achieved by Raphael was impossible. Already in Raphael's work a compromise between religious austerity and pagan grace had been observable. The simplicity of Giotto was gone beyond recapture. Correggio could only be original by carrying onward to its ultimate perfection the element of beauty for its own sake introduced by Raphael. Like Euripides, Cor-

### *Greek Tragedy and Euripides.*

reggio was condemned to the misfortune of separating beauty from the idea, the body from the spirit. With them the forces inherent in the germs of their respective arts were exhausted. But those who rightly understand them, must, we imagine, be prepared to accept with gratitude the existence of Correggio and Euripides, both as complementing Giotto and Æschylus, and also as accounting for the meridian splendour of Sophocles and Raphael. Without the cadence of Euripides the majestic aria of Sophocles would hardly be played out. By studying the Correggiosity of Correggio we comprehend how much of mere æsthetic beauty is held in solution in the work of Raphael. It is thus, as it were, that like a projectile, arts describe their parabolas and end.

To return in detail to the Greek tragedians. Æschylus determines at all hazards to exhibit the chosen mythus in its entirety, and to give full prominence to his religious idea. Hence we have to put up with much tediousness—a whole Chæphoræ, for example. But hence the unrivalled majesty of the Agamemnon. Sophocles manipulates his subject more artistically, so as to make it harmonious without losing sight of its internal source of unity. But he already begins to disintegrate the colossal work of Æschylus—notably in his separation of the Trilogy and in his moralizing of the idea of Nemesis. With Euripides the disintegration is complete. He neglects the mythus altogether. The theosophy of Æschylus, always implicit in Sophocles, survives as a mere conventionality in the work of Euripides. Finally, like Praxiteles, he carves single statues of eminent beauty; like Correggio, he conceals his poverty of design beneath a mass of redundant elegances. What we have really to regret in the art of Euripides is that he should have endeavoured to compete at all with Æschylus and Sophocles upon the old ground of the tales of Thebes and Troy. Where he breaks new ground, as in the Medea, the Hippolytus, and the Bacchæ, he proves himself a consummate master. Here the novelty of his method shocks no sense of traditional propriety. He is not driven to flippant scepticism in dealing with time-honoured myths or to travesties of well-marked characters, in order to assert his individuality. These plays exhibit a complete unity of outward form, and a profound internal unity of passion and character. They are not surpassed in their own kind by anything that any other poet has produced; and if “the *chef d’œuvre* be adequate to the *chef d’œuvre*,” Euripides may here be pronounced the equal of Sophocles and Shakspeare.

To enter into an elaborate analysis of Euripides as a poet would be beyond the scope of this article, which has for its subject, the relation of the third great dramatist to his predecessors



and to Greek tragedy in general. Yet something must be added to justify the opinion we have expressed, that, though Euripides suffered by the constraint under which he laboured in competition with rivals who had nearly exhausted the resources of the tragic art, yet he displays beauties of his own of such transcendent merit as to place him in the first rank of the poets of the world. It would be a delightful task to attempt to do him justice in the teeth of a malevolent generation of critics, led by Schlegel and Müller, who do not understand him—to summon from the shadows of the Attic stage the “magnificent witch” Medea, pure-souled Polyxena, wifely Alcestis, fiery-hearted Phædra, chaste and cold Hippolytus, Andromache upon her chariot a royal slave, Orestes in his agony soothed by a sister’s ministrations, the sunny piety of Ion, the self-devotion of Menoikeus—intermingling perchance these pictured forms, pure, statuesque, and clear as frescoes from Pompeii, with choric odes and exquisite descriptions. The lyrics of Euripides are among the choicest treasures of Greek poetry: they flow like mountain rivulets, flashing with sunbeams, eddying in cool shady places, rustling through leaves of mint, forget-me-not, marsh-marigold, and dock. His landscapes are most vivid: in ancient poetry there is nothing to compete with the pictures of Cithæron, where the Bacchantes lie limb-length beneath the silver firs, their snakes asleep, and the mountain air ruffling their loose curls; or with the cave of Polyphemus, where the satyrs lead their flocks from pasture up the valley between chestnut-tree and chestnut to the lawns that overhang dark purple sea-waves. In the department of the picturesque Euripides is unrivalled. His paintings have the truth to nature, the delicately modulated outline, and the facile grace of the most perfect bas-reliefs.

But to attempt this labour of love is more than we have space to undertake. It must be enough for us to illustrate one quality which occupies a large space in the dramatic ethics of Euripides, and forms the motive of the action of his leading characters. The old religious basis of Nemesis having been abandoned by him, Euripides fell back upon the morality of passions and emotions. For his cardinal virtue he chose what the Greeks called *εὐθυμία*, stout-heartedness, pluck in the noblest sense of the word,—that temper of the soul which prepared the individual to sacrifice himself for the State, and to triumph in pain or death or dogged endurance rather than give way to feebler instincts. That this quality should be prominent in Euripides is not without significance. Not only did it enable him to construct most thrilling scenes: it also harmonized with the advancing tendencies of Greek philosophy, which already held within itself the germs of Stoicism—or the theory of *καρτερία*. One of the most dramatic

exhibitions of this virtue occurs in the *Phœnissæ*. The Seven Captains are beleaguering Thebes, and affairs are going ill with the garrison. Tiresias, however, prophesies that if Creon's son, Menoikeus, will kill himself, Thebes must triumph. Creon accepts the prophecy but seeks to save his son; he sends for Menoikeus and instructs him how he may escape to Dodona. Menoikeus pretends to agree with what his father counsels, and, after true Euripidean fashion, sends Creon to get his journey-money. Then the boy, left alone upon the stage, turns to the Chorus and begins his speech :\*—

“How well have I my father's fears allayed  
With fraudulent words to compass my own will!  
Lo, he would filch me hence, with shame to me,  
Loss to my fatherland. An old man's heart  
Deserves some pity.—What pity can I claim  
If I betray the land that gave me birth?  
Know then that I shall go and save the state,  
Giving my life and dying for this land.  
For this is shameful; if beneath no ban  
Of oracles, bound by no force of fate,  
But standing to their shields, men dare to die  
Under the ramparts of the town they love;  
While I, untrue to brother and to sire,  
And to my country, like a felon slink  
Far hence in exile! Lo, where'er I roam,  
All men would call me coward! By great Zeus,  
Who dwells among the stars, by bloody Ares,  
Who made the dragon-seed in days of old  
Lords of the land, I swear this shall not be!  
But I will go, and on the topmost towers  
Standing, will dash into the murky den  
Where couched the dragon, as the prophet bade.  
Thus will I free my country. I have spoken.  
See then, I leave you: it is no mean gift  
In death I give the city; but my land  
I purge of sickness. If all men were bold  
Of their good things to work the public weal,  
I ween our towns had less of ills to bear,  
And more of blessings for all days to be.”

\* With the *Phœnissæ* in our hands, let us translate one other passage which displays the power possessed by Euripides of composing a dramatic picture, and presenting pathos to the eye. Eteocles and Polynices have been wounded to the death. Jocasta, their mother, and Antigone, their sister, go forth to the battle-field to find them :—

"Then rushed their wretched mother on the twain,  
 And seeing them thus wounded unto death  
 Wailed: 'O, my sons! too late, too late I come  
 To succour you!' Then, clasping them by turns,  
 She wept and mourned the long toil of her breasts,  
 Groaning; and by her side their sister groaned:  
 'O, ye who should have been my mother's stay  
 In age, O, thoughtless of my maiden years  
 Unwedded, dearest brothers!' From his chest  
 Heaving a heavy breath, King Eteocles heard  
 His mother, and stretched forth a cold damp hand  
 On hers, and nothing said, but with his eyes  
 Spake to her by his tears, showing kind thoughts  
 In symbols. Then the other, who still breathed,  
 Looked at his sister and the queen, and said:  
 'We have perished, mother! yea, I pity thee,  
 And this my sister, and my brother dead;  
 For dear he was—my foe—and yet was dear.  
 Bury me, O, my mother, and thou, too,  
 Sweet sister, in my father's land, I pray;  
 And close my dying eyelids with thy hand,  
 Mother!'—Upon his eyes he placed her hand—  
 'And fare you well! Now darkness clips me round.'  
 Then both breathed out their weary life together.  
 But the queen, when she saw this direful end,  
 Maddened with anguish drew the dead man's sword,  
 And wrought things horrible; for through her throat  
 She thrust the blade; and on her dearest falling  
 Dies, and lies stretched clasping both in her arms."

But to return to the virtue of *εὐφροσύνη*. The play of "Hecuba" contains a still more touching picture of heroism in death than that displayed by Menoikeus. Troy has been taken. Ulysses is sent by the Greeks to inform Hecuba that her daughter Polyxena must be sacrificed. Hecuba reminds him how in former days he had come disguised as a spy to Troy, and how she had recognised him, and, at his strong entreaty, spared him from discovery. In return for this, let him now spare her daughter. Frigidly and politely Ulysses replies, "True, lady, a life for a life. You saved mine, I would do something to save yours; but your daughter is quite another person. I have not the pleasure of having received benefits from her. I must trouble her to follow me." Then Polyxena breaks silence:—

"I see thee, how beneath thy robe, O king,  
 Thy hand is hidden, thy face turned from mine,  
 Lest I should touch thee by the beard and pray.  
 Fear not: thou hast escaped the god of prayers  
 For my part. I will rise and follow thee,  
 Driven by strong need; yea, and not loth to die.

Lo! if I should not seek death, I were found  
A cowardly life-loving selfish soul!  
For why should I live? Was my sire not king  
Of all broad Phrygia? Thus my life began.  
Then was I nurtured on fair bloom of hope  
To be the bride of kings; no small the suit,  
I ween, of lovers seeking me: thus I  
Was once—ah, woe is me! of Idan dames  
Mistress and queen, 'mid maidens like a star  
Conspicuous, peer of gods, except for death;  
And now I am a slave: this name alone  
Makes me in love with death—so strange it is."

Sheer contempt of life, when life has to be accepted on dishonourable terms, is the virtue of Polyxena. But, so far, though we may admire her fortitude, we have not been touched by her misfortune. Euripides reserves the pathos after his own fashion for a picture. Talthybius, the herald, is telling Hecuba how her daughter died:—

"The whole vast concourse of the Achaian host  
Stood round the tomb to see your daughter die.  
Achilleus' son, taking her by the hand,  
Placed her upon the mound; and I stayed near;  
And youths, the flower of Greece, a chosen few,  
With hands to check thy heifer, should she bound,  
Attended. From a cup of carven gold,  
Raised full of wine, Achilleus' son poured forth  
Libation to his sire, and bade me sound  
Silence throughout the whole Achaian host.  
I, standing there, cried in the midst these words:  
'Silence, Achaians! let the host be still!  
Hush, hold your voices!' Breathless stayed the crowd,  
But he: 'O, son of Peleus, father mine,  
Take these libations pleasant to thy soul,  
Draughts that allure the dead: come, drink the black  
Pure maiden's blood, wherewith the host and I  
Sue thee: be kindly to us; loose our prow,  
And let our barks go free; give safe return  
Homeward from Troy to all, and happy voyage.'  
Such words he spake, and the crowd prayed assent.  
Then from the scabbard, by its golden hilt,  
He drew the sword, and to the chosen youths  
Signalled that they should bring the maid; but she,  
Knowing her hour was come, spake thus, and said:  
'O, men of Argos who have sacked my town,  
Lo, of free will I die! let no man touch  
My body: boldly will I stretch my throat.  
Nay, but I pray you set me free, then slay;  
That free I thus may perish: 'mong the dead,  
Being a queen, I blush to be called slave.'

The people shouted, and King Agamemnon  
 Bade the youths loose the maid and set her free :  
 She, when she heard the order of the chiefs,  
 Seizing her mantle, from the shoulder down  
 To the soft centre of her snowy waist  
 Tore it, and showed her breasts and bosom fair  
 As in a statue. Bending then with knee  
 On earth, she spake a speech most piteous :  
 ' See you this breast, oh ! youth, if breast you will,  
 Strike it ; take heart ; or if beneath my neck,  
 Lo ! here my throat is ready for your sword !'  
 He willing not, yet willing, pity-stirred  
 In sorrow for the maiden, with his blade  
 Severed the channels of her breath ; blood flowed ;  
 And she, though dying, still had thought to fall  
 In seemly wise hiding what eyes should see not.  
 But when she breathed her life out from the blow,  
 Then was the Argive host in divers ways  
 Of service parted ; for some bringing leaves,  
 Strewed them upon the corpse ; some piled a pyre,  
 Dragging pine trunks and boughs ; and he who bore none,  
 Heard from the bearers many a bitter word :  
 ' Standest thou, villain ? Hast thou then no robe,  
 No funeral honours for the maid to bring ?  
 Wilt thou not go and get for her who died  
 Most nobly, bravest-souled, some gift ?' Thus they  
 Spake of thy child in death : O, thou most blessed  
 Of women in thy daughter, most undone !"

The same quality of *εὐψυχία* which we have seen in Menoikeus and Polyxena, is displayed by Makaria in the Herakleidæ and by Iphigenia in the last scene of her tragedy at Aulis. Another shade of the same virtue gives a peculiar attraction to the self-devotion of Alcestis in her death, and of Electra in her attendance on the brain-sick Orestes. It is noticeable, by the way, that Euripides, the so-called woman-hater, has alone of the Greek poets subsequent to Homer, with the single exception of Sophocles, devoted his genius to the delineation of female characters. It is impossible to weigh occasional sententious sarcasms against such careful studies of heroic virtue in woman as the Medea, the Iphigenia, the Electra, the Polyxena, the Alcestis, of our poet. Aristophanes, who was himself the worst enemy Athenian ladies ever met with, describes Euripides as a foe to women, apparently because he thought fit to treat them, not as automata, but as active, passionate, and powerful agents in the play of human life. But to return to our illustrations of *εὐψυχία*. In the Medea and the Hippolytus, Euripides again displays this virtue of stern Stoicism in two women. But here the heroines are guilty : their Spartan endurance of anguish to the

death, is tempered with crime. These tragedies are the master-pieces of the poet ; in each of them the single passion of an individual forms the subject of the drama. Separated from all antecedents of ancestral doom, Medea and Phædra work out the dreadful consequences of their own tempestuous will. Not "Othello" and not "Faust" have a more complete internal unity of motive. No modern play has an equal external harmony of form. "Medea" was one of the most romantic figures of Greek story. Daughter of the sungod in the Colchian land of mystery and magic, she unfolded like some poisonous flower, gorgeous to look upon, with flaunting petals and intoxicating scent, but deadly. Terrible indeed in wiles, she learned to love Jason. By a series of crimes, in which the hero participated as her accomplice, and of which he reaped the benefits—by the betrayal of her father's trust, by the murder of her brother, by the butchery of Pelias—she placed her lover on the throne of Thessaly. Then Jason, at the height of his prosperity, forgetting the love, as of some tigress, that the sorceress bore him, forgetting too her fatal power of life and death, cast his eyes on Glauké, the king's daughter of Corinth, and bade Medea go forth with her sons, a Pariah—a dishonoured wife. Whither should she turn ? To Colchis, and the father whose son she slew ? To Thessaly, where the friends of Pelias still live ? Jason does not care. His passion for Medea has vanished like a mist. Their common trials, common crimes—trials which should have endeared them to each other ; crimes which were as strong as hell to bind them—have melted from his mind like dew. He only wishes to be rid of the fell woman and to live a peaceful life with innocent home-keeping folk. But on one thing Jason has not reckoned—on the awful fury of his old love ; he forgets how she wrought by magic and by poison in his need, and how in her own need she may do things terrible and strange. In the same way we often think that we will lightly leave some ancient, strong, habitual sin, of old time passionately cherished, of late grown burdensome ; but not so easily may the new pure life be won. Between our souls and it there stands the fury of the past.

Medea in her house, like a lioness in her den, has couched, sleepless, without food, not to be touched or spoken to, since the first news of Glauké's projected bridal was told. No one knows what she is meditating. Only the nurse of her children mistrusts her fiery eyes and thundrous silence, her viperish loose hair and throbbing skin. The moment is finely prepared. Some Corinthian ladies visit her, and she, though loth to rise, does so at their prayer, excusing her reluctance by illness, and by a foreigner's want of familiarity with their customs. Pale, calm, and terrible, she stands before them. From this first appearance

of Medea to the end of the play, her one figure occupies the whole space of the theatre. Her spirit is in the air, and the progress of the action only dilates the impression which she has produced. The altercations with Creon and with Jason are artfully conducted so as to arouse our sympathy and make us feel that such a nature is being driven by the intemperance and selfishness of others into a *cul-de-sac* of crime. The facility with which she disposes in thought of her chief foes, as if they were so many flies that have to be caught and killed, is eminently impressive. "Many are the ways of death : I will stretch three corpses in the palace—Creon's, the bride's, my husband's. My only thought is now of means—whether to burn them or to cut their throats—perchance the old tried way of poison were the best. They are dead." *Kai δὴ τεθνᾶσι*. Medea knows *they* cannot escape her. For the rest, she will consider her own plans. In the scene with Jason she rises to an appalling altitude. Her words are winged snakes and the breath of furnaces. There is no querulous recrimination, no impotence of anger ; but her spirit glows and flickers dragon-like against him, as she stands above him on the pedestal of his ingratitude. But when he has gone, and she sits down to reconsider her last act of vengeance—the murder of his sons and hers—then begins the tragic agony of her own soul. These lines reveal the contest between a mother's love and the pride of an injured woman, the *ἐνψυχία* of one who must steel her heart in order to preserve her fame for fortitude and power :—

"O Zeus, and justice of high Jove, and light  
Of Sun all-seeing! Now victorious  
Over my foes shall I pace forth, sweet friends,  
To triumph !

I shudder at the deed that will be done  
Hereafter : for my children I shall slay—  
Mine ; there is none shall snatch them from me now.

Let no one deem me timid, weak of hand,  
Placidly tame ; but of the other temper,  
Harsh to my foes and kindly to my friends."

Then when Glauké, arrayed in the robe Medea sent her, is sinoudering to ashes with her father in slow phosphorescent flame, Medea sends for her children and makes that last speech which is the very triumph of Euripidean rhetoric :—

"O, children, children ! you have still a city,  
A home, where, lost to me and all my woe,  
You will live out your lives without a mother !  
But I—lo ! I am for another land,  
Leaving the joy of you—: to see you happy,

To deck your marriage-bed, to greet your bride,  
To light your wedding torch shall not be mine!  
O me, thrice wretched in my own self-will!  
In vain then, dear my children! did I rear you;  
In vain I travailed, and with wearing sorrow  
Bore bitter anguish in the hour of childbirth!  
Yea, of a sooth, I had great hope of you,  
That you should cherish my old age, and deck  
My corpse with loving hands, and make me blessed  
'Mid women in my death. But now, ah me!  
Hath perished that sweet dream. For long without you  
I shall drag out a dreary doleful age.  
And you shall never see your mother more  
With your dear eyes: for all your life is changed.  
Woe, woe!  
Why gaze you at me with your eyes, my children?  
Why smile your last sweet smile? Ah! me; ah! me!  
What shall I do? My heart dissolves within me,  
Friends, when I see the glad eyes of my sons!  
I cannot. No: my will that was so steady,  
Farewell to it. They too shall go with me:  
Why should I wound their sire with what wounds them,  
Heaping tenfold his woes on my own head?  
No, no, I shall not. Perish my proud will.  
Yet whence this weakness? Do I wish to reap  
The scorn that springs from enemies unpunished.  
Dare it I must. What craven fool am I,  
To let soft thoughts flow trickling from my soul?  
Go, boys, into the house: and he who may not  
Be present at my solemn sacrifice——  
Let him see to it. My hand shall not falter.  
Ah! ah!  
Nay, do not, O my heart! do not this thing!  
Suffer them, O poor fool; yea, spare thy children!  
There in thy exile they will gladden thee.  
Not so: by all the plagues of nethermost Hell  
It shall not be that I, that I should suffer  
My foes to triumph and insult my sons!  
Die must they: this must be, and since it must,  
I, I myself will slay them, I who bore them.  
So is it fixed, and there is no escape.  
Even as I speak, the crown is on her head,  
The bride is dying in her robes, I know it.  
But since this path most piteous I tread,  
Sending them forth on paths more piteous far,  
I will embrace my children. O, my sons,  
Give, give your mother your dear hands to kiss!  
O, dearest hands, and mouths most dear to me,  
And forms and noble faces of my sons!  
Be happy even there: what here was yours



Your father robs you of. O, delicate scent!  
 O, tender touch and sweet breath of my boys!  
 Go, go, go, leave me! Lo, I cannot bear  
 To look on you: my woes have overwhelmed me!  
 Now know I all the ill I have to do:  
 But rage is stronger than my better mind,  
 Rage, cause of greatest crimes and griefs to mortals."

Phædra, the heroine of the *Hippolytus*, supplies us with a new conception of the same thirst for *εὐκλεία*—the same *εὐψυχία*, *γενναϊότης*, indifference to life when honour is at stake. The pride of her good name drives Phædra to a crime more detestable than Medea's, because her victim Hippolytus is eminently innocent. We do not want to dwell upon the pining sickness of Phædra, which Euripides has wrought with exquisitely painful details, but rather to call attention to Hippolytus. Side by side with the fever of Phædra is the pure fresh health of the hunter-hero. The scent of forest-glades, where he pursues the deer with Artemis, surrounds him; the sea-breeze from the sands, where he trains his horses, moves his curls. His piety is as untainted as his purity; it is the maiden-service of a maiden-saint. In his observance of the oath extorted from him by Phædra's nurse, in his obedience to his father's will, in his kindness to his servants, in his gentle endurance of a painful death, and in the joy with which he greets the virgin huntress when she comes to visit him, Euripides has firmly traced the ideal of a guileless, tranquil manhood. Hippolytus among the ancients was the Paladin of chastity, the Percival of their romance. Nor is any knight of mediæval legend more true and pure than he. Hippolytus first comes upon the stage with a garland of wild flowers for Artemis:—

"Lady, for thee this garland have I wove  
 Of wilding flowers plucked from an unshorn meadow,  
 Where neither shepherd dares to feed his flock,  
 Nor ever scythe hath swept, but through the mead  
 Unshorn in spring the bee pursues her labours,  
 And maiden modesty with running rills  
 Waters the garden. Sweet queen, take my crown  
 To deck thy golden hair: my hand is holy.  
 To me alone of men belongs this honour,  
 To be with thee and answer when thou speakest;  
 Yea, for I hear thy voice but do not see thee.  
 So may I end my life as I began."

Even in this bald translation some of the fresh morning feeling, as of cool fields and living waters, and pure companionship and a heart at peace, transpires. Throughout the play, in spite of the usual Euripidean blemishes of smart logic-chopping and pragmatistical sententiousness, this impression is maintained. Hip-

polytus moves through it with the athletic charm that belongs to such statues as that of Meleager and his dog in the Vatican. At the end the young hero is carried from the sea-beach, mangled, and panting out his life amid intolerable pain and fever-thirst. His lamentations are loud and deep as he calls on Death the healer. Then suddenly is he aware of the presence of Artemis :—

“ O, breath and perfume of the goddess ! Lo,  
I feel thee even in torment, and am eased !  
Here in this place is Artemis the queen.”

The scent of the forest coolness has been blown upon him. His death will now be calm.

*A.* Poor man ! she is ; the goddess thou most loved.  
*H.* Seest thou me, lady, in what plight I lie ?  
*A.* I see thee ; but I may not drop a tear.  
*H.* Thou hast no huntsman and no servant now.  
*A.* Nay, truly, since thou diest, dear my friend.  
*H.* No groom, no guardian of thy sculptured shrine.  
*A.* 'Twas Kupris, the arch-fiend, who wrought this woe.  
*H.* Ah, me ! Now know I what god made me die.  
*A.* Shorn of her honour, vexed with thy chaste life.  
*H.* Three of us her one spite—behold ! hath slain.  
*A.* Thy father and his wife, and thirdly thee.  
*H.* Yea, and I therefore mourn my sire's ill hap.  
*A.* Snared was he by a goddess's deceit.  
*H.* Oh ! for your sorrow in this woe, my father !  
*T.* Son ! I have perished : life has now no joy.  
*H.* I mourn this error more for you than me.  
*T.* Would, son, I were a corpse instead of you.  
*A.* Stay ! for though earth and gloom encircle thee,  
Not even thus the anger unavenged  
Of Kupris shall devour at will thy body :  
For I, with my own hand, to pay for thee  
Will pierce of men him whom she mostly dotes on,  
With these inevitable shafts. But thou,  
As guerdon for thine anguish, shalt henceforth  
Gain highest honours in Træzenian land,  
My gift. Unwedded maids before their bridals  
Shall shear their locks for thee, and thou for ever  
Shalt reap the harvest of unnumbered tears.  
Yea, and for aye, with lyre and song the virgins  
Shall keep thy memory ; nor shall Phædra's love  
For thee unnamed fall in oblivious silence.  
But thou, O son of aged Ægeus, take  
Thy child within thy arms and cherish him ;  
For without guile thou slewest him, and men,  
When the gods lead, may well lapse into error.  
Thee too I counsel ; hate not thy own father,  
Hippolytus : 'twas fate that ruined thee.”

Thus Artemis reconciles father and son. Hippolytus dies slowly in the arms of Theseus, and the play ends. The appearance of the goddess, as a lady of transcendent power more than as a divine being—her vindictive hatred of Aphrodite, and the moral that she draws about the fate by which Hippolytus died and Theseus sinned, are all thoroughly Euripidean. Not so would Æschylus the theologian, or Sophocles the moralist, have dealt with the conclusion of the play. But neither would have drawn a more touching picture.

It is hard, while still beneath the overshadowing presence of so great a master as Euripides, to have patience with the critics and the scholars who scorn him—critics who cannot comprehend him, scholars who have not read him since they were at school. Decadence! is their cry. Yet what would they have? Would they ask for a second Sophocles, or a revived Æschylus? That being clearly impossible, beyond all scope of wish, why will they not be satisfied with beauty as luminous as that of a Greek statue or a Greek landscape, with feeling as profound as humanity itself, and with wisdom "musical as is Apollo's lute?" These are the qualities of a great poet, and we contend that Euripides possesses them in an eminent degree. It is false criticism, surely, to do as Schlegel, Müller, and Bunsen have successively done—to measure Euripides with his predecessors, or to ransack his plays for illustrations of pet dramatic theories, and then because he will not bear these tests, to refuse to see his own distinguished merits. It would sometimes seem as if our nature were exhausted by its admiration of a Sophocles or a Shakspeare. There is no enthusiasm left for Euripides and Fletcher. Euripides, after all is said, incontestibly displays the quality of radiancy. On this we are willing to base a portion of his claim to rank as a great poet. An admirer of Æschylus or Sophocles might affirm that neither Æschylus nor Sophocles chose to use their art for the display of thrilling splendour. However that may be, Euripides, alone of Greeks, with the exception of Aristophanes, entered the fairyland of dazzling fancy which Calderon and Shakspeare and Fletcher trod. The "*Bacchæ*," like the "*Birds*," proves, what otherwise we might have hardly known, that there lacked not Greeks for whom the "*Tempest*" and "*A Midsummer Night's Dream*" would have been intelligible. Meanwhile in making any estimate of the merits of Euripides, it would be unfair to omit mention of the enthusiasm felt for him by contemporaries and posterity. Mr. Browning, in the beautiful monument which he has recently erected to the fame of Euripides, has chosen for poetical treatment the well-known story of Athenians rescued from captivity by recitation of the verses of their poet. There is no reason to

doubt a story which attests so strongly to the acceptance in which Euripides was held at large among the Greeks. Socrates, again, visited the theatre on the occasion of any representation of his favourite's plays. By the new comedians, Menander and Philemon, Euripides was regarded as a divine miracle. Tragedy and comedy, so dissimilar in their origins, had approximated to a coalition; tragedy losing its religious dignity, comedy quitting its obscene though splendid personalities; both meeting on the common ground of daily life. In the decadence of Greece it was not Æschylus and Aristophanes, but Euripides and Menander, who were learned and read and quoted. The colossal theosophemes of Æschylus called for profound reflection; the Titanic jokes of Aristophanes taxed the imagination to its utmost stretch. But Euripides "the human, with his droppings of warm tears," gently touched and soothed the heart. Menander with his facile wisdom flattered the intellect of worldly men. The sentences of both were quotable at large and fit for all occasions. They were not too great, too lofty, too resplendent for the paths of common life. We have lost Menander, alas! but we still possess Euripides. It seems a strange neglect of good gifts to shut our ears to his pathetic melodies and ringing eloquence—because, forsooth, Æschylus and Sophocles had the advantage of preceding him, and were superior artists in the bloom and heyday of the young world's prime.

---

ART. II.—THE GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF ANIMALS  
AND PLANTS, GEOLOGICALLY CONSIDERED.

1. *The Geographical Distribution of Mammals.* By ANDREW MURRAY. London. 1866.
2. *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life.* By CHARLES DARWIN, M.A., F.R.S., &c. Second Edition. London. 1860.
3. *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex.* By CHARLES DARWIN, M.A., F.R.S., &c. 2 Vols. London. 1871.
4. *The Malayan Archipelago.* By ALFRED WALLACE, F.L.S., &c. 2 Vols. London. 1869.
5. *Contributions to the Theory of Natural Selection.* By ALFRED WALLACE, F.L.S. London. 1870.
6. *The Naturalist on the Amazons.* By HENRY BATES. 2 Vols. London. 1863.
7. *The Student's Flora of the British Islands.* By Dr. HOOKER, F.R.S. London. 1870.
8. *Migrations Vegetales, in "Revue des Deux Mondes."* By M. MARTINS. 1870.
9. *Recherches sur le climat et la végétation du pays Tertiaire.* By Professor HEER. Paris. 1861.
10. *The Geological Relations of the Existing Fauna and Flora of the British Islands.* By Professor EDWARD FORBES. London. 1846.
11. *The Atlantis Hypothesis in its Botanical Aspect.* By Professor OLIVER, in "Nat. Hist. Review." 1862.
12. *New Holland in Europe.* By Professor UNGER. Translation in Seemann's "Journal of Botany." 1865.
13. *The Principles of Geology.* By Sir CHARLES LYELL, Bart., F.R.S., &c. Tenth Edition. 2 Vols. London. 1868.

THE subject we have chosen for treatment in the present article is one of the deepest interest to naturalists. As yet, however, it is surrounded by much that is vague and disconnected. The facts of which it treats have only fallen into their harmonious arrangement since the publication of the "Origin of Species." Darwin may well claim that only from his point of view can the subject of the Geographical Distribution of

animals and plants be scientifically treated. The manner in which this question has been taken up by naturalists all over the world shows the influence which a great mind has over its fellows. Natural history has received a similar impetus under the Darwinian theory that astronomy did under the older Copernican.

It is our purpose, in the following pages, to briefly review the subject of the distribution of existing animals and plants, in the light of palæontology, as well as of those geological phenomena which have produced such enormous physical changes on the surface of our earth. In doing so it will be plainly seen that the relations of the existing fauna and flora are more intimate as we approach the present epoch. Indeed there is no fact in modern geology so generally admitted as the impossibility of severing the various groups of existing animals and plants from those of bygone ages. As most of our readers are aware, these ages are usually grouped under three great divisions, relatively termed the Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary. These names indicate their relative antiquity. Each division is provisionally subdivided into epochs, and thus the geological nomenclature is made up. But even before Darwin advanced his views, the principal naturalists had been forced to see that the life-systems of these various stages were related to each other, and together formed one grand total which might be regarded as the biological history of our planet. Of these systems the existing one is the last, and bound to the rest by lines of descent. These lines can be traced far away to the dim Laurentian age, but are strongest as the geological student ascends the geological scale towards the present time. The most stubborn of anti-Darwinists has to confess that the tertiary species of animals and plants, relatively few though they be, are nearly related to their present representatives.

Geology has passed through many social phases in its brief history. The classification of Comte is certainly correct when applied to the stony science. It has existed simply as a catalogue of *lusus naturæ*, just as astronomy was hidden under the form of astrology. Then it emerged into daylight, only to be the butt of theological animosity and ridicule. Gaining strength by its grasp of facts, it had subsequently to be ill-treated at the hands of its friends under the form of "Reconciliation" theories, until, like the infant Hercules, it has strangled the snakes in its cradle, and has arisen to impress its indelible influence on almost every phase of modern thought. Unfortunately, the idea that the various geological periods were marked by distinct life-forms—the product of the earlier French school of geological thought—which were successively created and destroyed, has not yet completely died away. There are not wanting eminent natu-

realists who still cling to this idea, although their number is every year becoming fewer. The natural corollary from this idea is that the *present* creation of animals and plants is also special, and the result of a separate and distinct act of creative power. It will be our aim to show the fallacy of this notion, and to bring to bear upon it the most recent investigations in natural science. In doing so we shall be obliged also to deal with another and equally gross mistake—viz., that the earth's crust contains no "missing links." To no science is geology more indebted than to zoology. Only by its aid have geologists been able to understand the exact relations of extinct to living forms of life. Numerous though these fossil species are, the rocks of Great Britain alone having yielded nearly fourteen thousand, we arrive at the striking discovery that they are all reducible to the same orders and classes as their modern representatives. The natural history classification, intended to embrace the recent fauna and flora, will equally include the faunas and floras of every period of the earth's past history. This proves that the *plan* of their construction, at least, has never been altered. In numerous instances extinct forms have enabled the naturalist to render this classification more complete, by filling up the gaps which before existed, and thus drawing the various orders and classes nearer to each other. Recent researches in palæontology and natural history have been travelling towards the same goal from opposite points. The former has been multiplying the list of existing species found in the fossil state, and the latter has been bringing to light the fact that many so-called extinct forms are still living in abysmal and unexplored depths of the sea. We stated the great benefits which zoology has conferred on geological science, especially in the earlier years of the latter's history; geology has now arrived at a maturity and strength which enables it to repay its foster-mother the debt it owes. By the knowledge of its organic remains it has enabled zoologists to understand many a problem which before was incomprehensible. Its latest act of filial gratitude is to assist naturalists in accounting for the geographical distribution of animals and plants. Not many years ago this was their besetting difficulty. Even the gigantic intellect of Humboldt had to be content with guessing at a truth which has only been made known since his death. The occurrence of animals and plants so unlike each other, in districts where the physical and geographical conditions were so similar, might well prove a hard nut for non-geological naturalists to crack. It has been the necessity of seeking the lineal ancestry of existing species in the geological epochs which approached most nearly to our own, that has caused us to see what perils and migrations they have undergone through the

slowly changing physical conditions. Instead of regarding the present animal and vegetable populations of the globe as a distinct and synchronous creation, separated from any that went before, we are compelled by the sheer weight of facts, to regard them as the direct results. The whole secret of their geographical distribution and isolation, apart from the laws of natural selection which have been in operation, is to be found in an intimate knowledge of the geological changes which have impressed themselves on physical geography.

It is well known that the farther we go back in time, to study the different animals and plants, the more are we struck with their *unlikeness* to anything now living. The primeval forms have been thrust aside by others better fitted to take a leading position in the great battle of life. Analogous functions have been performed by successive and distinct groups; a few types, however, have stood the heat and burden of the fight, and to these we will devote a sentence or two of notice. They bear much the same relation to existing forms that the Celtic words in our language do to the Saxon, Danish, and Norman, which subsequently overlaid them. One geographical peculiarity is always true of these ancient groups—they exist in widely severed latitudes. The most striking fact, perhaps, in the whole life-history of our planet, is that the farther we go back in time, the more lowly organized is the sum total of species, whether of animals or plants. Now it is exactly these forms which have had the greatest geological antiquity. Whilst one type of specialized organism after another has passed away, the humbler forms have maintained their ground unchanged, or nearly so, in organization. It is the moral of the oak and the reed: the storm which felled the former has simply beat the latter to the ground, to spring to its original position after the blast has passed away. These lowly organized types have now the most cosmopolitan distribution, so that, in this respect, they resemble higher forms, which also have a great antiquity. Among the lichens brought by Sir James Ross from the high latitudes of the southern hemisphere, the greater portion were found to be specifically identical with those growing in Europe. Professor Owen mentions one species of Foraminifera (*Webbina rugosa*) which has continued in existence since the Liassic period. We give the following as the most remarkable of the known instances of the geological antiquity of certain groups. The *Nautilus*, *Terebratula*, *Rhynchonella*, *Lingula*, &c., have had a continuous range of existence ever since Silurian times at the least. During the Primary epoch, the commonest and most widely distributed fishes were the Ganoids, an order distinguished by being covered with enamelled bony plates, instead of horny scales.



This dominant group gradually dwindled during the latter stages of the Secondary epoch, and was replaced by other orders, which are now as cosmopolitan as the Ganoids once were. But there still exist what we may term "outliers" of this ancient fish-fauna, in the Bony Pike of North American lakes and rivers, in the *Polypterus* of South Africa, and in the recently discovered and rare "Mud Fishes" (*Ceratodus*), of Australia. Our common Sturgeon is nearly related to this interesting group. Günther says that these Ganoids now form only three and a half per cent. of known species of fish. The widely isolated character of this fauna plainly enough indicates its antiquity, and as surely foretells its ultimate extinction. Taking into account its former widely diffused condition, is it not evident that the isolated areas it now occupies are mainly to be ascribed to geological causes? Again, so far as is yet known, the only warm-blooded animals which lived during the entire Secondary epoch (with the exception of such rare forms as the *Archæopteryx*) were Marsupials. They became extinct in Europe during the Mid-tertiary, or Miocene period, although we still find them living in lands as far apart from each other as North America and Australia. There is every reason for believing that the latter country has been dry land since the close of the Secondary age, at the least, so that its characteristic modern mammalia may be traced thus far back in time. The Australian cave breccias yield gigantic extinct forms of the same order and no other. In America, the opossums represent this group, and their peculiar features, when compared with those of their Australian representatives, only too surely indicate the immense period of time which has elapsed since they were blood relations! Another illustration from the more ancient formations, and then we will proceed to notice how the lineage of existing forms becomes clearer as we come to the Tertiary epoch. That many of the Secondary *genera* of shells are still in existence, is well known, among which the commonest are, *Tellina* (which then first appeared), *Cardium*, *Cardita*, *Mya*, *Solen*, *Trochus*, *Pecten* (which had appeared in the Primary epoch), and a multitude of others. But one illustration we cannot forego. In the upper English chalk strata we meet with a species of brachiopod (*Terebratulina lineata*) which the best palæontologists recognise as identical with the existing *Rhynchonella caput-serpentis*. The antiquity of the latter species might have been guessed at from its peculiar geographical distribution. It is common to both sides the Atlantic, as well as to the South African and Chinese seas. This wide severance of the areas from each other, it cannot be too firmly insisted upon, is in every case illustrative of the antiquity of a species. Dr. Carpenter and Prof. Wyville-Thomson believe we are still

living in a Cretaceous epoch, owing to the cretaceous *faunes* of the Abysmal fauna.

As just remarked, when we come to study the relations of the Tertiary fauna and flora to those now in existence, the lineage becomes so striking that in many instances it appears almost like that of father and child. This rule holds good, also, in that we find the relationship to be nearer in proportion as we approach the human epoch. The earlier stages of the Tertiary age are most interesting on account of the distribution of animals over European latitudes whose natural home we have been in the habit of supposing was far away. The commonest of mammalian species peculiar to this era are the Tapir-like animals first made known to the scientific world by the genius of Cuvier. This group is now limited to such widely severed and isolated areas as parts of South America and the Malayan archipelago, two species being met with in the former region, and one in the latter. The tapiroid animals had as cosmopolitan a distribution during the early Tertiary, or Eocene period, as the marsupials, above mentioned, enjoyed during Secondary times. Their present limited areas of occupation are due to the numerous physical changes which have passed over those countries where their bones are found in the fossil condition, so that their geographical isolation is a good index to what has taken place in this respect since the Tapir family was domiciled in Europe. It is more than probable that, since then, the two great continents of India and America have been disjoined. The high grounds of this submerged area are still occupied by the Pacific islands and coral reefs, the very existence of the latter being, according to Darwin, sufficient evidence that the depression is still going on. Even such apparently insignificant animals as land snails have been subjected to the same geographical changes as larger and more important groups. A common snail in the United States (*Helix labyrinthica*) is abundantly found in the fossil state in certain Eocene beds in Hampshire—a sure proof of its having once lived in that county as it is now living in America, and an equally eloquent testimony to the physical changes which have narrowed its distribution to its present localities. The fossil plants of the early Tertiary epoch speak to the same effect as the fossil animals. Unger has shown that the Eocene beds of Europe contain one hundred and seventy-three species closely analogous to forms now growing so far away as New Holland, and the southern hemisphere generally—another illustration that widely dissevered localities of existing species is good evidence of their antiquity. If the latter rule be good, the philosophical student would apply it to every case, whether of animals or plants, even though their remains had not been met with in the fossil condition. As Darwin has shown, the fossil

evidence is extremely fragmentary, nor would the most sanguine of geologists expect the whole fauna and flora of every geological period to be perfectly preserved in the rocks, seeing that the preservation of the forms he meets with is due wholly to accidental causes. A glance at such books as Loudon's "*Hortus Britannicus*" will show that certain genera include species whose geographical localities are as far asunder in distance as they possibly can be. In our opinion, such cases speak very plainly of their antiquity. A short time ago it was imagined that true woody trees, except the *coniferæ*, did not appear before the Tertiary epoch, when they were regarded as fit associates for the great number of new forms of mammalia then introduced. But the discovery of such well known forms as the Oak, Fig, Myrtle, Walnut, Banksia, Dryandra, &c., in the upper cretaceous deposits of Aix-la-Chapelle, has shown how great is the antiquity of these now almost cosmopolitan genera. Time and space forbid us to do more than glance at the tropical character of the early Tertiary fauna and flora. If we could lay one land surface over another—the condition in which the Hibernian affirmed his rightful inheritance to be—and place a slice of Borneo or Sumatra so as to overlie merrie England, we should have as near an approximation to Eocene conditions in this country as we could imagine!

The middle period in the Tertiary epoch—that commonly known to geologists as the Miocene, bears out our argument still further. Here it is that we first meet with the most abundant evidence of the *direct* ancestry of our living animals and plants, which since then have been distributed over the entire surface of the earth. Of all the fossils of this important period, the vegetable organisms are the most complete, and it is from them that we can derive our most important and correct generalizations. First of all, they point to a much warmer climate—placed by Professor Heer as sixteen degrees higher than the present—existing over Europe. This temperature, however, was not so elevated as during the previous Eocene period, as is very evident when we compare the fossil floras of the two eras. Beds of lignite, of Miocene age, rich in fossil plants, are met with in Switzerland, Germany, Scotland, Ireland, Devonshire, Iceland, Greenland, and Spitzbergen. The high northern character of the last mentioned localities shows us that when these plants grew there, in consequence of the mean elevation of temperature, it is probable that no *ice-cap* existed at the North Pole, to the extreme of which this gorgeous flora may have extended. For it must be recollected that these fossil plants afford every evidence of their having grown on or near the spots where they are now found, and that they were not floated or drifted thither. We find the petals, stamens, pistils,

and even the *pollen* of the flowers preserved. Many of the leaves have their backs covered with "bunt" and "rust"—fungi which affected them then as they attack their representatives at the present day! This alone is strong evidence that the flora is indigenous.

When we come to analyse what may be termed the Geographical character of this Miocene flora—no matter what part of Europe may be selected for the purpose—we are at once struck with its peculiarities. It is not a *European* flora, so much as one now more or less distributed all over the globe. The percentages of the fossil plants enable us even to point out the routes which the vegetable migrations subsequently took, whilst geological processes explain the means by which they became limited to the regions they now occupy. The large number of species we have to deduce from almost wholly precludes the possibility of a mistake. Thus in Switzerland alone the Miocene beds have yielded upwards of eight hundred species of true flower-bearing, or *phænogamous* plants alone, besides mosses, ferns, &c. The total number of fossil plants catalogued from these beds, cryptogamous as well as phænogamous, is upwards of three thousand. It is the latter on which most reliance can be placed for the purposes we seek, and we shall therefore leave the former more or less out of our calculations. Among this large number of flower-bearing plants, three hundred and twenty-seven species, or nearly one half, were evergreens. Since this gorgeous flora was decidedly European, it has become more or less cosmopolitan, and been scattered by geological agencies nearly all over the world. The majority of the species have migrated to America; next we find genera that remained European. Afterwards, in the order in which they are represented in the fossil state, we find other species which have been transferred to Asia, Africa, and even to Australia. The American types are in the largest proportion. This is the most persistent feature of the Miocene flora wherever we study it in the Old World. Their analogues now grow in the forests of Virginia, North and South Carolina, and Florida. They include such familiar examples as Magnolias, Tulip-trees, Evergreen Oaks, Maples, Plane-trees, Robinias, Sequoias, &c. The higher climature of the mid-Tertiary period is further corroborated by the testimony of the fossil plants now growing elsewhere than in America. Professor Oliver, who so skilfully laid down the relations of the Miocene flora to existing forms, in the *Natural History Review* for 1864, has there shown that we must seek for the European species of the Miocene beds by the shores of the Mediterranean; and the Asiatic types in the Caucasus and Asia Minor generally. Camphor trees, now such very characteristic objects in Japanese

scenery, abound in the fossil state in these strata even as far north as Iceland, Greenland, and Spitzbergen!

The only deposits of the age we are now considering, to be found in England, are at Bovey Tracey, in Devonshire, where the Lignite, or "Brown coal," as it is also called, is worked for the purpose of baking coarse pottery. In this very limited area fifty species of fossil plants have been met with, twenty of which are common to the above-mentioned Swiss deposits. These fifty species include evergreen Oaks, Fig-trees, Vines, Laurels, Dryandras, &c.

In the Isle of Mull we meet with strata of the same age, and again at Antrim, in Ireland; but their floral yield has hitherto been small. In fact, these beds are mainly interesting on account of their possessing evidence of the last active volcanoes in the British isles. The Greenland beds have yielded several hundred species to the zeal of Mr. Whymper, and their general teaching is pretty much the same as those of Switzerland, allowing for difference in latitude.

The fossil Miocene flora of Iceland numbers four hundred and twenty-six species of true flower-bearing plants, exclusive of others. Amongst this great number are such woody types as the Birch, Willow, Juniper, Rose, Oak, Maple, Plane-trees, Vines, Walnuts, &c., all of them now characteristic of genial temperate conditions. The geology of the Aleutian islands—which more or less connect the Old World with the New—indicates a connexion of these two great continents during the Miocene period. All of them possess fresh-water deposits, remarkable for their containing rich stores of fossil plants, marked by the same geographical peculiarities we have already noticed as characteristic of those in Switzerland, and elsewhere. Here we have proof that when the Old World and the New were joined by a continuous tract of land, now more or less occupied by the sea, that land was clothed, owing to the mild temperature, with a rich and varied flora. As if to supplement the teachings of the Swiss lignite beds, as yielded up to a careful study of the plants, the *insects* found associated with them are marked by similar geographical peculiarities, and include genera now as widely scattered as the flora. The Oeningen beds have yielded over nine hundred species of fossil insects, whilst the entire number which has been obtained from all the beds of the upper and lower Miocene formations of Switzerland amount to more than thirteen hundred! Among them we find the white ants (*Termites*), now so peculiar to subtropical regions, as well as dragon-flies of the South African, and not European type. The Miocene strata of Austria have yielded fossil butterflies almost, if not quite, identical with Indian species.

These facts point clearly to the conclusion, that the reason why the Southern States of North America are now occupied by a flora which was *European* during the Miocene age, is that such flora migrated thither by way of that continuous land whose geographical as well as geological outliers are to be found in Japan, Kamschatka, the Aleutian islands, Vancouver's Island, &c. This generalization is borne out by a study of existing plants in some of the localities mentioned. The most significant of the facts is, that the further we go *east* in the Old World, the more numerous relatively do we find living species which occur fossilized in the Swiss lignites. The *Salisburia*—recently introduced into this country for its singularly graceful foliage—is now limited to the Japanese regions, although it occurs in the fossil state in North America. There are more than three hundred existing species of plants common to the Southern portion of the United States and Japan than to Europe. So that in this respect Japan is more nearly related to the New World than it is to that of which it forms an easterly prolongation! The northerly plants common to Europe, Asia, and North America, are all found growing on the Aleutian islands, which, as before remarked, stretch across the North Pacific. It seems almost incredible to suppose that a Continent has been broken up since comparatively recent times; but we shall presently see that other changes, of quite as great geographical importance, have also transpired in the interval.

It may be asked, how it is that the flora which indicates a former land connexion between Asia and America, is now principally confined to the southern states of the latter country? Our next endeavour will be to answer this, and to point out that it was the gradual incoming of the great northern winter, geologically known as the "Glacial Epoch," which drove what previously had been northern and temperate animals and plants into more southerly latitudes. The Pliocene period succeeded the Miocene, and the organic remains peculiar to it are plainly marked by evidence of a gradual refrigeration of climature throughout the whole northern hemisphere. That the plants now living in such areas as South Carolina once had a more northerly extension, is proved by those very species being found fossil in strata of the Pliocene age in Tennessee and elsewhere. This fact not only indicates the way in which such a flora spread southerly, but connects living with Miocene species, and thus clearly establishes *lineage*.

A glance at the more ancient species of animal life, from the mid-Tertiary period upwards, is full of interest, on account of its supplementing what has been clearly pointed out by a careful comparison of vegetable organic remains. We have already

noticed the singular agreement between the Swiss Miocene flora and its entomology, as regards their geographical character. Our next attention will be given to the proofs that the same cause which drove the flora southerly, and isolated it in its present localities—the cold of the Glacial period—operated equally on the animal kingdom, so that its geographical distribution may, in a great measure, be assigned to the same cause. In the Miocene beds of the Sewalik Hills, so admirably and patiently worked out by the late Dr. Falconer, we have numerous evidences of geographical conditions which have since then been wonderfully disturbed, and of animals living in India which have subsequently been distributed elsewhere. The giraffe and rhinoceros were then Indian, although they are now confined to Africa. Did space permit, other peculiarities might be mentioned of a similar nature. During the same period the monkey was a European animal, and it is more than probable that the last survivor of this group is represented by the rare, protected species which inhabits the rock of Gibraltar. The well known “Crag” of Norfolk and Suffolk represent the Pliocene period in Great Britain. Among the hundreds of species of fossil shells they include are forms now living in the West Indian, Indian, and Japanese seas, and in the Pacific Ocean. Nothing could more plainly illustrate the gradual increment of cold, than a comparative study of the southern and northern species of shells found in these three “Crag.” At the same time, their elephantine, rhinocerine, and hippotamus remains indicate how abundant these animals were in England before the commencement of the *Glacial Epoch*.

The Ice-cap, which evidently began to form at the North Pole during the earlier part of the Pliocene period, gradually increased its area, and crept further south on all sides. Between the latest “Crag” deposit and the “Drift” beds—the latter of which were formed under undoubted Arctic conditions—we have a sequence of the most unbroken kind, which illustrates, by its increased percentage of northern shells, how the cold was intensifying in this country. At length we had a rigid Arctic climate extending over mid-Europe. The Arctic species of animals and plants accompanied the physical ice invasion, until eventually Europe was peopled by them in the Old World, and the United States of America in the New. The climate can be geologically proved to have intensified in the latter country, as we know it to have been the case in this. There still exist, in both areas, a few animals and plants which plainly tell of a continued land-connexion, and as lucidly point out the era of this land being broken up as occurring just before the Glacial period began, or during its progress. The common *pike* still lives in American, as well as

in English, rivers; the common heather has been found scantily blooming on the hills to the north of Boston, just as it purples the mountains of Scotland and England. Scarcely any difference can be detected between the American and European *beavers*, although the greater extended period of civilization in the Old World has encroached on its haunts, and thus almost rendered it extinct.

The physical and geographical changes which took place during this great northern winter were of a most extensive nature. We have ample evidence that the entire area of Great Britain was eventually submerged, to the depth of at least seventeen hundred feet! Over the greater part of this tract were strewn the thick beds of sand, gravel, and clay, termed by geologists the "Northern Drift." Arctic mollusca then lived in British seas in Arctic proportions. Icebergs from the north, laden with "erratic" boulders, gravel, &c., stranded in the shallower waters, and thus introduced northern plants into Britain and Europe. The subsequent upheaval of the country, until dry land appeared, was doubtless quite as slow a process as that of submergence. In the south of Europe we have proofs of even greater physical disturbances than those which once more made Britain into a sea-bottom, whilst the "drift" beds were forming in this country, limestone beds were being laid down over what is now Sicily, and these were afterwards upheaved to three thousand feet above the sea-level. A great portion of North Africa was then under water, the latter occupying the present desert of Sahara. Here it was that the terrible burning sands were originally accumulated. British mollusca had migrated southerly, driven thither by the encroaching cold, and taken up their positions in Sicilian and African seas, just as the Arctic species had occupied the English area. Hence they are found fossil, both in the Sicilian limestones, and beneath the drifting sands of the African deserts. Most, if not all, the species of Rhinoceri, Hippopotami, Elephants, Hyæna, &c., passed over to Africa and Asia, where their descendants still exist. Only those species remained behind which could adapt themselves to the changed conditions. These appeared on the dry land, and spread themselves over that portion which was uplifted towards the close of the Glacial epoch. As the woolly-haired mammoth (*Elephas primigenius*) and woolly-haired rhinoceros, their remains are met with in post-glacial deposits, whilst in Northern Asia their tusks have accumulated to such a degree, and been so well preserved, as to form the "Ivory Mines" of Siberia! In the deeper and colder portions of the British seas there still exist, as Professor Edward Forbes pointed out, a few species of mollusca which came over during the great Arctic invasion, and, having retained suitable habitats



after the warmer conditions ensued, remained behind, to add the mite of their testimony to the general mass of evidence. Perhaps one of the best illustrations of this influence of the former Arctic climate upon the geographical distribution of animals, is that given by Mr. Andrew Murray, in his elaborate work on the "*Geographical Distribution of Mammals.*" Two species of *seal* are now living, one in the Caspian sea, and the other in Lake Baikal. As is well known, the latter is situated almost in the centre of the great Asiatic continent. As its name implies, it is completely isolated from any other body of water, as is also the case with the Caspian. Baikal is purely a fresh-water lake, whilst the Caspian has only one-third the ordinary saline properties of sea-water. The seals found living in these two great lakes belong, one of them to the same species as that still frequenting the northern shores of Britain, and the other to a species exceedingly abundant in the North Atlantic. We know that a depression of five hundred feet would once more bring the Arctic sea over the areas both of the Caspian and Lake Baikal. And we have seen that, during the Glacial period, Britain was submerged to more than three times that depth. We therefore quite agree with Mr. Murray, that the only way we can account for the presence of these seals in isolated bodies of fresh and nearly fresh water, is by supposing that when Northern Asia was uplifted from the bottom of the glacial sea, the two lowest hollows remained filled with water, in which the seals were shut off from their oceanic fellows. Their habits were subsequently altered, gradually, to suit their new conditions, and these, it would seem, were attended with certain varietal differences which distinguish them from their marine brethren. That they flourish under such apparently anomalous circumstances is evident by the fact that seal fisheries are profitably conducted both in Lake Baikal and the Caspian Sea.

Important though the information thus furnished by the animal kingdom may be on geographical distribution, that afforded by Botany is even still more impressive. The geology of the "drift" beds enables us to understand how it was possible for Arctic floras to pass from Arctic regions so as to occupy the summits of even Equatorial mountains. Mr. Croll, from astronomical deductions, fixes the date of the Glacial period at two hundred and forty thousand years ago, and estimates its duration at one hundred and sixty thousand years. This calculation, although it has a good deal of probability about it, can only be regarded as provisional. There is, however, good reason for believing that the Glacial epoch—which was not the first our northern hemisphere had experienced—was mainly due to cosmical agencies. An enormous amount of physical change could

be wrought in the period assigned by Croll, especially as the rigorous climature, and the encroachment of the northern ice-cap over the available area of occupation, would crowd species more together, and thus render the "struggle for existence" all the keener. It is estimated that the northern shores of the Baltic are being elevated at the rate of about three feet in a century. In one hundred thousand years this would elevate them as high as we know the Sicilian beds have been upheaved since the commencement of the Glacial epoch.

It was after the emergence of Europe from this Arctic sea, that floral migrations began more particularly to spread over her. The climate was still rigorous in its character, the snow-line coming down in the winter, probably to near the sea-level, as it now does in Greenland. Over the available area, arctic plants spread themselves, finding luxuriant habitats in the newly formed subsoils of the "drift." The hairy mammoth, woolly-haired rhinoceros, the Irish elk, the musk ox, reindeer, glutton, lemming, &c., more or less accompanied this flora, and their remains are always found in the post-glacial deposits of Europe, as low down as the South of France. In the New World, beds of the same age contain similar remains, indicating that they came from a *common northern centre*, and were spread over both continents alike.

When the animals and plants of the Arctic and sub-Arctic regions of the Old and New Worlds are compared, one cannot but be surprised at their identity. All, or nearly all, belong to the same genera, whilst many of the species are common to the two great continents. This is most important in its bearing on our theory, as indicating that they radiated from a common centre *after* the Glacial period. When we explore the temperate regions of the same countries, we find the floral and faunal differences increasing, as one would expect in remembering that many of the species date from the Miocene epoch. In equatorial latitudes this contrast reaches its climax. No other theory will explain this peculiarity than that Arctic and sub-Arctic species have spread *since* the Glacial epoch, whereas the southern and equatorial forms are *older* geographically, and were driven to their present areas of occupation by the slowly, but surely, advancing cold of the period in question.

The flora characteristic of Britain is marked by being opposed to extreme cold on the one hand, and intense heat on the other. It is a flora, therefore, which could only have possessed the plains of England after the rigidity of the long-continued glacial cold had given way to warmer conditions. In fact, it is a recent introduction, and there can be little doubt that its original home was Asia Minor. Most of our common English

plants are now equally as common in Japan. Our familiar flora seems to have originated in almost the same centre as Man himself! Possibly much of it may have accompanied his wanderings, as we know it does attend the footsteps of the modern English emigrant. Any one looking over Dr. Hooker's recently published, admirable "Student's Flora of the British Islands," cannot but be astonished to see how geological barriers more or less coincide with the geographical distribution of our commonest British plants. Of these barriers the great Sahara is one, and the northern flanks of the Himalayas another. We have seen that the former was *sea* during the period of the "drift," which, of course, would forbid the northern migration of African species of plants. After its elevation, the burning sands of the desert formed a barrier quite as effective as a sea. Hence, as Mr. Andrew Murray has lucidly remarked, for all practical purposes in zoology and botany, we may regard that part of Africa, north of the Sahara, as a portion of Europe situated in Africa. It has a preponderance of European animals and plants, and was doubtless connected with Europe, by way of Gibraltar, before it was with Southern Africa.

The common flora we have spoken of as now occupying "merrie" England, is botanically known as "Celtic." But, besides this, we have even in this country an admixture of other floras, whilst the continent of Europe is marked by a blended association even more strongly. In this respect, their occupation is not unlike the mixture of Latin and Teutonic races due to the successive disturbances and invasions during the earlier stages of European history. For example, in the Pyrenees we have several species of plants still growing which must have had a continuous European descent from Miocene times. They have been adapted to the physical changes meantime at the expense, perhaps, of specific alteration. The *Ramondia* and *Dioscorea* really belong to Japan and China, and, as M. Martins has observed, to find them growing on the Pyrenees is as striking as if we found a family of Chinese or Japanese people living in the same regions. The Dwarf Palm, again—the only species of its kind left growing in Europe—an inhabitant of southern France, reminds us of pre-glacial circumstances as much as the occurrence of a European monkey on Gibraltar brings to our recollection the former extension of its race, of which it is now the single outlier.

It would not be expected, especially from an evolutionist point of view, that plants whose species have a long ancestry would grow in any great abundance over areas which have been subjected to successive geological changes. We have already spoken of an arctic flora having first occupied the newly-emerged lands of the "Drift"

in Britain, and we return to the subject now for more detailed examination. When the warmer changes ensued which resulted in the present climature, the difference rendered the arctic flora unable to compete with the incoming Asiatic plants to which it was so favourable. Accordingly the former ceded the ground, the only places remaining open to them being the cold sides and summits of the higher mountains, where they would not be likely to be expelled by the newly introduced lowland and warmth-loving flora. Hence it is that we still find them growing on the margins of European glaciers, or on the tops of our English, Welsh, Irish, and Scotch mountains. On the Faulhorn, in the Canton of Berne, at nine thousand feet above the sea-level, there grow one hundred and thirty-two species of flowering plants, of which fifty-one are common to Lapland, and eleven to Spitzbergen. On the Engadine, a high valley in the Canton des Grisons, there are found eighty species of plants unknown to the rest of Switzerland, but very common in the extreme north of Europe. Taking the alpine flora of Switzerland as a whole, we discover that out of a total number of three hundred and sixty species, one hundred and fifty-eight are common to Scandinavia and northern Europe generally. The relation of the European alpine flora to that of the arctic regions may also be obtained by reversing this comparison. Thus, out of six hundred and eighty-five flower-bearing plants found in Lapland, one hundred and eight are also met with on the Swiss Alps. This extension of the arctic flora during the Glacial period is proved in a similar way on the Pyrenees, where we meet with sixty-eight species of plants which are common to Scandinavia. Thus do the very anomalies in natural history assist in the process of their own explanation!

Having rapidly glanced at the immediate influence of the later geological phenomena upon existing zoology and botany, let us next inquire whether the various physical disturbances have been such as to enable us to investigate geographical distribution by the aid of certain general principles? This is not altogether impossible. For example, we may lay it down as a good rule, that islands which are separated from adjoining continents by *shallow seas*, have been insulated within a much more modern period than those separated by *deep seas*. We find that the flora and fauna of islands are related to those of the mainland in proportion to the depth of the intervening waters. Great Britain herself is a good illustration of the principle. She has no fauna peculiar to herself, except the well known Red Grouse, and only one plant, a species of orchid (*Spiranthes*). All the rest are exactly like what we find on the Continent. Our land and fresh-water shells, fresh-water fish, &c., are identical, and as

these could not have crossed the salt sea, it is evident they must have spread over England before she was severed from the European mainland. Deep seas are always indicative of longer periods of time to effect the depression, so that, if an island had been separated from Europe in Miocene times, its fauna and flora would still possess more or less of a Miocene *faunes*. Such is the case with Madeira, the Azores, &c. ; they were formed as volcanic islands early in the Tertiary period, and peopled by straggling birds, insects, plants, &c., from the adjacent mainland, as Sir C. Lyell has so clearly shown in the later editions of his "Principles." The absence of all mammalia, except bats, proves that this was the process (which Dr. Darwin has so clearly explained in his "Origin of Species") by which such ancient volcanic islands were first stocked. Their areas have been considerably upheaved since then, and beds of volcanic ash are found in them, enclosing shells allied to those which lived on the mainland during the Miocene period. The existing land shells are lineal descendants of these. The plants of Madeira are also marked by similar belated features.

Somewhere about the time that our Norfolk and Suffolk "crags" were being laid down, there were extensive geographical and zoological changes taking place in other parts of the world, besides the northern hemisphere. We have evidence of a similar cold epoch in the southern hemisphere to that which took place in the northern, although it does not seem to have been of so extensive a character, or of so long a duration. Whilst it lasted, however, Antarctic plants were driven northerly, just as in the northern hemisphere they were subsequently forced southerly by analogous agencies. Darwin mentions that *Australian* plants are still found growing on the summits of the mountains of Borneo, and other islands of the Malayan Archipelago. They also extend along the highest parts of the Peninsula of Malacca, and are thinly scattered, on the one hand over the mountainous regions of India, and on the other over similar tracts as far north as Japan. In some of the higher parts of Equatorial regions we find Arctic and Antarctic plants in strange community, the former predominating, perhaps on account of the greater proportion of land in the northern hemisphere. We deduce from this occurrence an oscillation of extreme climates, or glacial epochs, in the northern and southern halves of the globe alternately. Since the Antarctic glacial period concluded, the Malayan Archipelago has been formed by a breaking up of a prolongation of the Indian continent. Previous to this occurrence, there had been a similar extension of Australia in the opposite direction, so as to nearly join the former, and this had shared the same geographical fate, as the islands of New

Guinea, &c., plainly show. The community of fauna and flora is such that we cannot be surprised native tradition should assert that Java, Sumatra, Bali, Lombok, &c., were all formerly united. The mountains of these islands form a continuous chain. The Asiatic animals and plants terminate at Bali, whilst the Australian commence at Lombok, thus showing that the tradition is zoologically wrong, if nearly geographically correct. In 1845, Mr. Earl pointed out that Java, Sumatra, and Borneo all stood on a plateau which was covered only by a shallow sea. The map indicates that this plateau is nowhere more than a hundred yards in depth. Mr. Wallace has last worked at this zoological problem, and with his usual keen perception of causation, has clearly shown how the fauna and flora of the Malayan islands are nearly allied to the Peninsula. Dr. Sclater was the first to notice that the dividing line between the Asiatic and Australian fauna must be drawn down the Straits of Macassar, and Mr. Wallace subsequently showed that this line ought to be continued southwards through the Straits of Lombok. Looking at the islands which seem to act as a series of stepping-stones between India and Australia, it would never be suspected that they could be divided into two such distinct zoological regions. The elephant, rhinoceros, and tapir are found in Borneo of exactly the same species as those inhabiting India. These animals could not have swum across the neighbouring straits, and therefore must have existed over the area before the extended peninsula had been broken up into islands. When we come to Lombok, we have a distinct group of animals and plants from the former. As Mr. Wallace remarks, although the "strait between this island and Bali is only fifteen miles wide, we may pass, in two hours, from one great division of the earth to another, differing as essentially in their animal life as Europe does from America." Through these straits, it has been shown, there runs a very rapid current, which more or less forbids migration from one group of islands to another. This, however, is not the sole cause of the striking difference in the natural history peculiarities of the two areas. The water in the straits is much deeper than in the great submarine plains which connect the islands of India on the one hand, and those of Australia on the other. The marsupials, cockatoos, bush-turkeys, lories, &c., of the Australian group certainly indicate their former connexion with the southern mainland. The conclusion arrived at by Mr. Wallace, and accepted by all philosophical naturalists, is, that the difference between the two groups of islands, as regards their zoological and botanical characters, is to be ascribed to the fact that when India extended uninterruptedly to Bali, and Australia to Lombok, there was still a strait, occupied by a deep and rapid

current, separating them. Hence it is that for ages the two regions have been geographically separated.

South Africa has evidently been dry land since the Secondary Age, and has only suffered from ordinary meteorological influences, unless we allow for a probable elevation of the whole area. The Palestine lakes seem to have been formerly connected with the great fresh-water lakes of Southern and Equatorial Africa. Sixteen species of fish occur in the former, of which five species are common to the latter; whilst only one species is common to the rivers which empty themselves into the Mediterranean. This solitary species may have been accidentally brought by some such agency as that of land birds; but we must look to more fundamental and geographical causes to account for so many species common to bodies of fresh-water situated at such a distance from each other. The raised beaches of the Dead Sea indicate an upheaval of the area, or the shrinking of its brackish waters, probably due to the increment of heat since the gradual waning away of the glacial cold. In the earlier stages of the Tertiary age, it is probable that South Africa may have been connected with India, by way of Madagascar, the Mauritius, and other islands. The *giraffe* originated in India, where its remains are found fossilized in the Sewalik deposits before mentioned. It is now extinct in that country, and met with only in Africa. The intimate connexion between the Indian and Cape buffaloes is employed by some naturalists as an argument in favour of the former terrestrial connexion between these two great countries. Mr. Murray regards the distribution of the *antelopes* as especially favouring this view. There exist altogether about one hundred and fifty species of antelopes, of which five-sixths are African. More than two-thirds of the entire number come from districts *south* of the Sahara, which forms their northern limit, just as we have seen it acts as the southern barrier to the European fauna and flora. Next to Africa, in the representation of the antelopes, comes India. So that it would seem, says Mr. Andrew Murray, as if Africa were the natural home of these creatures, and that they had come into existence there before its severance from India. Another connexion between the two continents is the occurrence of the *camel*, in the fossil state in India, and in the living condition in Africa. Some naturalists imagine there is good reason for believing that Africa was not greatly peopled by carnivorous animals before the Glacial epoch, when most of them were driven thither from higher latitudes by the increasing cold.

South America affords another illustration of a land surface which has been such for long-continued geological periods. The

huge mammalia, such as *Myiodon*, *Glyptodon*, *Toxodon*, *Megatherium*, &c., are all nearly allied to the characteristic groups still living over the same areas. To some of the animals, the Andes act as the principal geographical barrier, whence it would appear that this chain of mountains has been elevated since such species came into existence. The height at which very recent raised beaches have been found on the Andes, is proof of their comparatively late upheaval. Nor should the immense height of these mountains forbid the supposition we have entertained, as we know for a fact that Etna has been formed since the commencement of the Glacial period. Of the two species of *tapir* found in South America, one roams at some height on the mountains, and is covered with woolly hair, thus reminding us of the special adaptation of the *mammoth*, to protect it from the cold moisture, the other species wallows in the tropical rivers which water the forests and plains. Before the Glacial epoch began, four species of the genus *Equus*, or horse, lived in South America. It cannot be said it was not adapted to the country, as the fossil bones indicate it must have abounded in immense numbers; whilst the manner in which the modern horse has run wild since its introduction by the Spaniards, would plainly forbid such an idea. Its extinction, therefore, must have been the result of local geological operations. Contemporary with the native species of American horses there lived other forms, which we are equally in the habit of regarding as peculiar to the Old World. Among these were the elephant, mastodon, rhinoceros, &c., all of whose remains occur in the fossil state in deposits of the same age as those of Europe. Indeed, the *mastodon* would seem to have existed in America long after its extinction in this country. When driven southerly by the encroaching cold of the Glacial period, these animals were unable to cope with the huge arboreal mammalia whose long-continued possession had so suited them to the conditions of existence. The occurrence of the remains of the *camel*, in the fossil state in India, and of other species now living in Africa, and even South America, is a strong proof of the great antiquity of this genus. Indeed, next to the Marsupials and Tapirs, the Camel is one of the oldest living genera. We meet with it first in the early Miocene formations at the foot of the Himalayas. Then in the Pliocene period, a larger species (*Merycotherium*) roamed over Siberia and the easternmost boundaries of Asia, possibly crossing over to America by way of the then continuous land connexion of which the Aleutian islands are now the only relics. We next meet with two fossil species in Kansas, and of two others which evidently ranged over the greater part of the United States. Two fossil genera are peculiar to South America—the only part of the New



World where the camel family now exists, as the Alpaca and Llama testify. But perhaps the best proof of the immense ages that South America has been dry land is afforded by the peculiarities of its living fauna and flora. This is what Mr. Bates, in his "Naturalist on the Amazons," has appropriately termed *arboreal*—that is, adapted almost entirely to a forest existence. Of all the countries in the world, Central America is the most densely wooded, and this seems to have been its character for ages. Its monkeys are distinguished from those of the Old World, not only by the greater breadth between the nostrils, but more especially by their *prehensile* tails, which act the part of a fifth hand, and enable their owners to suspend themselves bodily from the boughs of trees whenever necessary. The Sloths, Opossums, Ant-eaters, and Porcupines are all arboreal; the last three, if not the first, also possessing prehensile tails, like the monkeys, and for a similar purpose. In addition to these we have only to name the Green Pigeons, Toucans, Tree-beetles, Bird-catching spiders, &c., to perceive the extent to which this arboreal adaptation is carried. The flora is equally strong in similar testimony. A great number of the genera are parasitic, either vitally or mechanically, and grow to such a prodigality as frequently to strangle the great trees to which they attach themselves. That a similar forest character distinguished this part of America in Tertiary times is evident from the remains of the gigantic Sloths, or *Megatheria*, which pulled down the trees to browse upon them, instead of climbing them like their modern representatives. Hence the long-continued arid surface of Southern Africa is testified to by the *Antelopes*, on the one hand—and on the other, in the same latitudes in America, there is equally strong proof of an extended forest-life!

We have endeavoured to glance at this deeply important subject by the aid of those philosophical naturalists whose names are affixed to the present article. A great deal of information on this subject requires collection and comparison. It is scattered through the scientific memoirs of most European Societies, and completely hidden away, not only from the general reader, but in a great measure from the scientific world as well. In conclusion, we think it is evident that only a thorough knowledge of Tertiary palæontology and physical geology can explain the anomalies of the distribution of existing animals and plants. We have several times referred to the existence of "natural barriers" to species, indicating that such barriers were related to the spread or otherwise of species. When these have been the result of geological operations, the natural history groups are found to be more or less coincident with them. To Dr. Sclater belongs the chief merit of mapping out the distribution of modern

faunas and floras—although Edward Forbes, in his masterly essay on the “Relation of the Pliocene Fauna and Flora to those of Modern Times,” was the first to indicate the direct lineage of existing species. The history of geographical botany and zoology only commenced in 1857, when Dr. Sclater sketched out his six principal regions for the distribution of birds. It might be imagined that creatures like these, gifted with the power of speedily changing their habitats, would be far more irregularly spread than plants, or even animals. But it has been found that, with some slight modifications, the same mapped-out provinces would include the general distribution of quadrupeds, reptiles, insects, land-shells and, to a certain extent, even plants. These six regions, now universally adopted by naturalists, are the following:—1. The *Neo-tropical*, comprising South America, Mexico, and the West Indies. 2. The *Neo-arctic*, including the rest of America. 3. The *Palæo-arctic*, comprehending Northern Asia as far as Japan, and Africa, north of the Sahara. 4. The *Ethiopian*, containing the rest of Africa and Madagascar. 5. The *Indian*, comprising Southern Asia, and the western half of the Malayan Archipelago. 6. The *Australian*, which includes the eastern half of the Malayan Archipelago, Australia, and most of the Pacific islands. The great geological changes of the Tertiary era group more or less round these six centres. Our task is now completed, and our reward will be ample if we have been able to indicate the unity which springs out of comparative diversity. Thus studied, in the dim light of the past as well as in the more effectual illumination of the present, otherwise disjointed and broken facts start together like the “dry bones” in the prophetic vision, and become animated with the life which has filled all creation from its earliest dawn until now.

---

### ART. III.—THE POLITICAL DISABILITIES OF WOMEN.

1. *Speech of John Stuart Mill, M.P., on the Admission of Women to the Electoral Franchise.* Spoken in the House of Commons, May, 1867.
2. *Speech of Jacob Bright, M.P., on the Electoral Disabilities of Women.* Delivered at Edinburgh on January 17, 1870.
3. *On the Forfeiture of Property by Married Women.* By ARTHUR HOBHOUSE, Q.C.
4. *The Married Women's Property Act, 1870. Custody of Infants Act, 1 & 3 Vict. cap. 54. Social and Political Dependence of Women.* Longmans and Co.
5. *Industrial Employment of Women of the Middle and Lower Ranks.* By JOHN DUGUID MILNE, Advocate, Aberdeen. Revised Edition. Longmans, Green, and Co.
6. *Woman's Suffrage Journal.* Edited by LYDIA E. BECKER. Vol. II. 1871. Trübner and Co.

THE question of the political disabilities of women, which, long dormant but never dead, has remained hidden in the hearts of thoughtful women, to be repressed with a sigh over the hopelessness of the attempt to gain a hearing, has suddenly sprung into life and activity, and assumed, in an incredibly short time, an acknowledged position among the most important social and political subjects which call for the attention of the nation. This result could not possibly have been attained unless the principles involved in the claim had been in harmony with those great ideas of progress and reform which have taken so deep a hold on the minds of the people of this country, and which have received so sudden a development in about the same period of time as that comprised in the history of our present movement. Within the last half century there has been a revolution in the principles which govern the distribution of political power. Shall the people be governed by rulers claiming to be divinely appointed, or shall they be ruled by representatives of their own choosing? Shall the right of the common people culminate in the claim for good government, or shall it rise to that of self-government? Is it enough for the populace that their irresponsible rulers shall govern them according to what they, the rulers, believe to be just and beneficial principles, or have those who must submit to laws and governance a right to be consulted in the election of the governors and the enactment of the laws?

Such is the problem which it has been the task of the last fifty years to solve, and which has resulted in the triumph of the principles of popular government by the passing of the Representation of the People Act of 1867. This principle is now accepted by both the great parties in the State. A measure based upon it has become law by common consent. It has therefore changed its position from that of one which had to be recommended and enforced by those who urged the adoption of any measure founded upon it, to that of one which is admitted to be established. Therefore any class in the community which seeks for the removal of political disabilities does so on principles which are now sanctioned by the Legislature as those on which the government of the country shall henceforward be conducted. We, who make this claim for the enfranchisement of women, do so from the feelings and for the reasons which have led other classes of the community to make the same claim, and we ask that our claim shall be decided by the same principles which have guided the judgment of the Legislature in the case of others. In making this demand we are, however, met at the outset with the allegation that the same principles of justice are not applicable to both sexes—that the claim which is just when made by a man, is unjust when made by a woman—that when men say that the Government has no moral right to hold them responsible to laws enacted without or against their consent, nor to tax the fruits of their labour without giving them a voice in the imposition and disbursement of such taxation, their complaint is just and reasonable, and deserves attention; but that when women say the same thing, their complaint is unjust and absurd, and must be suppressed. Now we say that we can see no reason for this alleged discrepancy, and we challenge those who maintain it to show cause why the same broad principles of justice are not applicable to all human beings. We maintain that women are equally liable with men to suffer from misgovernment—that they have the same interest as men in securing good government—that they have the same intelligence as men in regard to the method of obtaining it, and further, that the only security for good government, either of women or men, is that the governed shall be consulted in electing the rulers and making the laws. We say that the disadvantages and hardships entailed on women by their deprivation of representative government are analogous to those suffered by the lower classes at the hands of the more powerful interests in the country. Women complain of the want of the means of education, want of liberty to engage in honourable or lucrative professions, want of opportunity of earning the means of subsistence, want of security for the possession of their property, their tenure being forfeited by marriage;

want of sufficient protection for their persons from the violence of men; these and many other grievances are enough to justify any class of persons in seeking for their removal. Whether the special grievances of women are or are not precisely like those suffered by the common people at the hands of the privileged classes, there can be no doubt that they spring from the same root, political slavery, and their redress must be sought by the same means, political emancipation.

The theory on which the right of voting under the new Reform Act is ostensibly based is that of giving a vote for every household or home. Mr. Disraeli stated in the House of Commons that by the Act regulating the franchise, the House gave it, and intended to give it, to every householder rated for the relief of the poor. But when this declaration comes to be practically tested, it is found that about one-seventh of the ratepayers in every borough are adjudged to be out of the pale of representation. This happens though they are taxed to the same extent as the others, and, moreover, have been subjected to the special burdens imposed by the ratepaying clauses of the Representation of the People Act, for which the vote conferred by that Act was confessedly offered as an equivalent. A woman would be not only derided, but punished, who refused to obey a law on the ground that "man" did not include "woman," that "he" did not mean "she," and that therefore she was not personally liable for contravening any Act so worded. Accordingly, though the "occupiers" and "owners" who come under the operation of the ratepaying clauses of the Reform Act were referred to throughout by masculine pronouns only, women were made to pay the increased rates thereby imposed. These clauses bore with distressing severity on thousands of poor women, as we gather from police reports which appeared in London and other newspapers. At Hackney in one day more than six thousand persons, mostly women, were summoned for non-compliance with them; and at Lambeth, we are told that several poor women applied to Mr. Elliott for his advice how to save their "things" from being seized by the parish authorities for rates under these clauses. Mr. Elliott did not appear to have any power to help them, and the applicants left, lamenting that they were likely to have all their "things" taken for rates for the right to vote under the new Reform Act. But when women came into court to claim the vote conferred on the occupiers who were fined, they discovered that "words importing the masculine gender" were held to include women in the clauses imposing burdens, and to exclude them in the clauses conferring privileges, in one and the same Act of Parliament.

One of the excuses alleged for excluding women from the right

of voting, is a desire to save them from the unpleasantness of contact with a crowd during the conduct of an election. But no one proposes to force women to record their votes, and if they did not like the crowd, they would have full liberty to stay away and exempt themselves from the operation of the vote-giving clauses. But there was no escape from the operation of the ratepaying clauses; and under these, thousands of poor women were dragged from their homes, and haled before the magistrate, for no wrong that they had done, but solely by the operation of an Act from the benefits of which they were excluded under the pretext of exempting them from an unpleasant duty. Men must have a very low idea of the intelligence of women when they endeavour to impose on them by pretences such as these.

The political position of women under the existing law has been compared to that of minors, criminals, lunatics, and idiots. But a little examination will prove that the status of persons of all these classes would be considerably lowered were it reduced to that of women. Minority, if a personal, is merely a temporary disqualification. A householder who is a minor will in time come into the enjoyment of his vote. But adult women are kept throughout their lives in the state of tutelage proper to infancy. They are never allowed to grow up to the rights of citizenship. As Justice Probyn said, "Infants cannot vote, and women are perpetual infants." Criminals are also only temporarily disqualified. During the debate on the Bill of 1867, Lord E. Cecil proposed a clause providing that persons who had been sentenced to penal servitude for any offence should be incapable of voting. Mr. Gladstone objected to the clause because "a citizen ought not to bear for life the brand of electoral incapacity." Another member objected to "extending a man's punishment to the whole of his life." The clause was finally negatived. But the brand of life-long electoral incapacity, which was thought too severe for burglars and thieves, is inflicted without scruple on rational and responsible human beings, who have never broken the law, for the sole crime of womanhood. Parliament deems an ex-garrotter morally competent to exercise the franchise, whilst it rejects the petition of Florence Nightingale. So much for the moral standard required for the exercise of the suffrage. Let us now see what the law says to lunatics. In a legal text-book we find the following statement:—"With regard to a lunatic who, though for the most part he may have lost the sound exercise of his reason, yet sometimes has lucid intervals, it seems that the returning officer has only to decide whether at the moment of voting the elector is sufficiently *compos mentis* to discriminate between the candidates and to answer the questions, and take the

path if required in an intelligible manner.”\* But the law never allows that a woman can have a lucid interval during which she is sufficiently *compos mentis* to discriminate between the candidates, and to comply with the formalities incident to recording a vote. Thus it places her mentally below lunatics, as it does morally below felons. The courts have a very kindly consideration for the electoral rights of idiots, as a case quoted by Mr. Rogers will show. He states that the voter had no idea of the names of the candidates, but he had of the side on which he wished to vote. He seems to have been unable to answer the ordinary questions, and the returning officer rejected the vote of this idiot; but on appeal the decision was reversed, and the vote held to be good. Mr. Rogers states that it is difficult to determine, since the decision in the “Wigan Case,” what degree of drunkenness need to be shown in order to disqualify an elector. It is a question of fact for the returning officer to decide; and with respect to persons deaf, dumb, and blind, he says, that “although it is difficult to believe that such persons should have understanding, still if such a person can show by signs or otherwise that he knows the purpose for which he has come to the poll, and can also comprehend the obligation of an oath, and the temporal dangers of perjury, it is conceived that a returning officer would not be justified in refusing his vote.” It will be seen by these extracts that those who compare the political status of women to that of criminals, lunatics, and idiots, give too favourable a view of the facts. The true comparison is that which was used by Mr. Justice Byles in the Court of Queen’s Bench, when he likened the political condition of women to that of dogs and horses. After indignantly scouting the claims of woman to humanity: “I will not,” said the Judge, “allow that woman can be man, unless in a zoological treatise, or until she is reduced to the condition of fossil remains,” he proceeded to level the political rights of woman to those of the domestic animals. He would not even allow her to be “something better than his dog, a little dearer than his horse,” but assumed the absolute identity of the political rights of all three. The case was that of 1600 rate-payers, who had been placed on the register by the overseers of Salford, and who had been struck off by the revising barrister without inquiry, merely because they bore such names as Mary, Hannah, &c. No objection was raised by any one to these names, though they had been published in the usual way. The mayor, the overseer, and the public generally concurred in the propriety of retaining them, and the representatives of both Liberals and Conservatives in the Revision Court did their best

---

\* Rogers, “On Elections,” 10th edition, p. 163.

to keep them on the register, but in vain. Though the revising barrister expressed doubts as to whether he had a right to expunge the names, he said he should do so. This decision was appealed against, and the counsel was arguing that the revising barrister had exceeded his jurisdiction in striking off the names of persons not objected to, and the description of whose qualification was good on the face of it, when he was interrupted by the Judge asking whether he meant to say that if the barrister found the name of a dog or a horse on the register, he would not be justified in striking it off. This sudden question rather staggered the learned counsel, who had evidently up to that time not looked upon his clients as exactly on a level with brutes; but he could only follow the Judge's lead, and reply that in case a man happened to be called Ponto or Dobbin, he did not see why he should lose his vote.

In the election petition at Oldham, where a scrutiny was demanded, one set of objections turned on alleged legal incapacity of the voters. These comprised some aliens, some minors, and one woman, who, being upon the register, had recorded her vote. Mr. Justice Blackburn decided that the objections to the aliens and the minors should have been taken before the revising barrister, and that it was then too late to challenge the votes on the ground of legal incapacity, but a woman was not a man at all, and he should strike off her vote at once. He added, however, that if the vote became of consequence, he should reserve the point for the Court of Common Pleas. We hereby perceive what a mere fetish sex becomes according to the principles of English law. The attributes that distinguish man from the beasts are speech, reason,\* moral responsibility, and religious faith. Out of these attributes springs the capacity for political functions, for knowledge and experience, and for the formation of a stable, regular government. Yet in seeking the proper basis of a qualification on which to rest the possession of political power, men deliberately reject as insufficient all those attributes of reason and conscience which raise humanity above the brutes, and select one which they have in common with these.

We say that this principle is injurious, because it sets a stamp of inferiority on women. The opinion of a woman is not esteemed so highly as the opinion of a man, because the law does not deem it worthy of being taken into account in reckoning the votes of the people. This lowers women in their own eyes, and in the eyes of men. By making the capacity for feminine functions a

---

\* We must not be understood as denying that the lower animals reason to a certain extent; but this does not affect the argument, as the distinction between these and mankind is sufficiently marked.



disqualification for political functions, the female sex is depressed from its natural position as the one whose preservation is of the most importance in the human economy to that of one which is deemed of secondary consequence, and the welfare of the race suffers accordingly. The exclusion of women from political power has been defended on diametrically opposite grounds. On one hand it is said that the interests and sentiments of women are identical with those of men, and that therefore women are sufficiently represented by taking the votes of men only in the various classes of society. But if the opinions and interests of women are identical with those of men of a similar social grade, there could be no possible harm in giving them the same means of expressing them as are given to men. On the other hand it is said that women are morally and intellectually distinct from men ; that they possess mental attributes not inferior but diverse, and consequently the ideas which they may form on questions of national polity will be of a different character, or based on different principles, from those entertained by men. On this view, however, whether we regard political questions with reference to the interests of the community at large, or of the feminine element in particular, the recognition of the right of women to vote seems absolutely necessary in order to secure that fair representation of all classes of the community, and that impartial consideration of subjects involving the interests of these various classes, which is the final cause of representative government.

In illustration of this necessity we may refer to a speech by the present Attorney-General in the House of Commons during one of the debates on the Bill to render legal marriage with a deceased wife's sister. He is reported to have said :—" If ever there was a woman's question it was this one, and he asked if it were reasonable or generous to legislate on a matter of marriage against the well understood feeling of one of the sexes who were parties to it." Now whether Sir John Coleridge was right or wrong in his estimate of the feelings of his countrywomen on this question, there was surely justice in his appeal to the House not to legislate upon it without taking the sentiments of women into consideration. But under the present law what possible means exist for gauging the opinions of women on this or on any subject ? The process of carefully eliminating from the electoral body every person otherwise qualified who belongs to the sex whose views are especially desired seems singularly ill-adapted for the purpose of arriving at a trustworthy estimate of those views. Probably the opinions of women are divided on this question of the marriage law as on other topics, but until women are allowed to vote no one can possibly determine on which side the majority lies. Every attempt to do so is mere random guess-

work, and until women are allowed to express their sentiments as freely, as fearlessly, and in the same manner as men, no man has a right to speak in their name. Legislation in regard to the interests of women, by an assembly from which the representation of women is rigidly excluded, is truly a "leap in the dark." Another question specially affecting women is that of the right of married women to own property. Strange to say—or is it strange?—there seems less disposition to acknowledge the justice of consulting women in regard to this proposed amendment of the marriage law than on the other. In the debates which took place in both Houses of Parliament on the Married Women's Property Bill of 1870, it was throughout assumed that the matter must be settled according to men's notions of what was just and expedient for women. Women's ideas on the subject counted for nothing. The opponents of a change in the law relating to marriages of affinity appealed passionately on behalf of the presumed sentiments of women. They arrayed them in opposition to the measure, and claimed for them the right to be heard. But the opponents of a change in the law relating to the status of wives were silent respecting the opinions of women. Either they did not dare to appeal to them for fear of an adverse verdict, or they thought that although women might be generally in favour of the maintenance of the existing law, their opinions were not worth quoting in its defence.

The law relating to the property of women is an instance of flagrant wrong inflicted on the unrepresented half of the nation. What would be said of a law which deprived the majority of adult men of the right to own property? It would be at once concluded that such men had no votes, or they would not allow a session to pass without enforcing a measure to secure their rights. Yet this is exactly the position of the great majority of adult women under the common law of England. The Act of 1870 does not in any way interfere with this principle of the common law, but leaves it in full force. It merely extends to the personal earnings of women, to small amounts of property accruing to them by deed or will, and to certain descriptions of property, on special application, the facilities offered by the Chancery courts for evading this principle. It would not touch such a case as the following:—A woman selling oranges in the streets of Liverpool related her history to another woman as follows: Her first husband died leaving her in possession of a comfortable inn in Liverpool and one thousand pounds in the bank. She married again. The second husband, after living with her a short time, ran away to Australia, having previously paid a visit to the bank and drawn out the thousand pounds. The wife continued her business, by which she was able to earn

a comfortable subsistence for herself and a daughter by the first marriage. After a few years the prodigal husband returned without the thousand pounds, penniless, ragged, and ill. He professed penitence for his past offences and begged of his wife to forgive and receive him. She consented, and took care of him until he recovered. For a time all went well, the husband was kind and attentive, and the wife began to think they might be happy. One day the husband observed that he thought a drive in the country would do his wife good after the care of nursing him through his illness; he would order a carriage for her and her daughter. The wife did not wish to go, but in order to gratify her husband she consented, and she and her daughter departed. On her return she did not see her husband, but found a stranger in the bar. When she asked his business he produced a bill of sale by the husband to him of the house with all it contained and the business. The mother and daughter found themselves turned adrift homeless and penniless on the streets of Liverpool without appeal and without redress. The husband has not since been heard of.

This robbery was committed under the sanction of the marriage law, and the law which sanctions it is still in force.

Sometimes it is urged that since the husband is bound to maintain his wife, it is but just that he should pocket all her property and earnings. But this is a fallacious argument. The claim of a wife to maintenance by her husband is based on the performance by her of the duties of a wife. Her maintenance is an equivalent for services rendered—an equivalent to which she is justly entitled whether she owns property or not. In truth, in the majority of cases, a husband no more "maintains" his wife than a man does his footman or his cook. To each is given maintenance in requital of services rendered. A cook or footman receives wages in addition to maintenance—a wife usually does not. To claim from a wife in exchange for mere maintenance not only her personal services, which are a full equivalent, but the surrender of all the property she may possess or acquire independently of her husband, is to demand something for which no equivalent is offered.

Under a system of free trade in labour every able-bodied single man or woman is presumably capable of maintaining himself or herself by the exercise of bodily or mental powers. Each such person has two classes of labour to accomplish for this end:—1. Out-door labour—*i.e.*, the earning of the money necessary to procure food, clothing, and shelter. 2. Indoor labour—*i.e.*, the application of this money for the personal sustenance and comfort of the individual. It is not enough to earn money to purchase food in order to sustain a man; that food must be prepared

and made ready for his use. It is not enough to earn money to pay the rent and furniture of a house; a very considerable amount of daily labour is requisite in order to keep that house habitable and comfortable. Suppose the case of a labouring man working for wages, who had no domestic inmate—who had to light his fire, prepare his own breakfast, and ere he set forth for his day's toil had to make his bed and set his house in order. Then, when he returned for the midday meal, had to go to market to purchase the food, to cook it for himself, to wash up the dishes and arrange his room before he again went forth to his labour, to return at the close to repeat the same process before he could get his supper; and in addition to these daily toils, had the periodical scrubbing of the floor and washing of his clothes, and such mending as is rendered necessary by their wear and tear. It may be safely assumed that a man so circumstanced would not be able to earn more than half the wages which he could earn were he relieved of all these laborious and time-consuming offices. Let us imagine a woman similarly situated, half of whose time was consumed in out-door or money-earning labour, and half in domestic or comfort-earning labour. Let us now suppose that these two marry. In order to perform the domestic duties for the man, and thus set him free to devote his whole time to money-earning labour, the woman must give up that portion of her time which she had hitherto devoted to money-earning labour. Because of this, she has an equitable claim to share the money which this sacrifice on her part enables a man to earn. The claim of a wife to maintenance arises from the simple fact that marriage enables a man to earn money by relieving him from the burden of domestic cares, while it disables a woman from earning money by imposing upon her these cares.

The claim of a wife for maintenance we hold to be absolute under these circumstances—*i.e.*, where neither husband nor wife owns property or income other than the earnings of their daily labour. It becomes considerably modified when either possesses a fortune sufficient for maintenance without such labour. Since marriage need not of necessity, and would not, had the bill introduced in the House of Commons by Mr. J. G. Shaw Lefevre, in 1869, become law, have actually dispossessed a woman of her income or in any way disabled her from its possession or enjoyment, and since the possession of independent means of subsistence relieves her from the necessity of maintaining herself by marriage, and renders such an engagement a purely voluntary one on her part—the claim which a woman who gives up her independent means of subsistence in order to marry, has on the man at whose invitation she gives it up, does not exist, and in

the case of persons who marry possessed each of independent property, we should be disposed to admit that the claims of husband and wife upon each other for maintenance are mutual and equal.

But this difference in the condition is not recognised by our laws. Whatever obligation the law at present imposes on a man to maintain his wife is totally irrespective of the amount of her possessions: it is the same whether she be a beggar or an heiress. Moreover, this vaunted liability shrinks to the narrowest limits when examined. If a man refuse to supply his wife with food and clothing, she has no means of enforcing her claim upon him. No magistrate could listen to a woman who complained that her husband would not maintain her. All he could do would be to recommend her to apply to the parish, and then if the guardians chose to supply her with pauper's allowance they could recover the amount from the husband. But if the parish authorities were to find that the husband was in the receipt of good wages, and therefore to decide that they would not relieve the woman, she must starve, for the wife has no direct remedy against the husband for neglect to maintain her. Cases have occurred of women being actually starved to death under such circumstances.

If, instead of bringing his wages home to his wife, to be applied to the maintenance of the family, a man takes them to the public-house and spends them all in drink, the wife has no remedy. Yet surely, when the husband induced the wife to marry him on the faith that he would provide her with a maintenance, he contracted an obligation as binding and as capable of legal definition and enforcement as any other contract for the performance and reimbursement of personal services.

Suppose the common case of a working man paying court to a servant-girl in a good place. She is earning board and lodging of a much better quality than the wives of working men usually enjoy, and from ten to twenty pounds annually in addition. He asks her to leave all this, to give up all prospect of earning money, to devote herself to his service, to be not only his wife, but his servant—to wait upon him, to cook for him, to wash for him, to clean his house; and to perform all these arduous and multifarious duties, not only while she is well and strong, but through the period when the cares of maternity render them physically oppressive and injurious. In requital, he undertakes to provide her with uncooked food, lodging without attendance, and clothing. Now this is not a very tempting bargain, and commercially it cannot be considered advantageous. But such as it is, the terms ought to be carried out, and the law ought to provide means for enforcing their fulfilment. If the wife does not,

at the end of the week, receive a portion of her husband's wages sufficient to provide her with these things, she ought to have as ready a means of redress as the working man would have who, after performing his week's work, should find that his employer neglected to pay him his week's wages.

Were the rights of the wife to her share of the husband's wages recognised as fully as the right of the workman to his share of the profit of his labour, a husband would no more think of defrauding the wife of her due than the employer now thinks of defrauding his workmen of their wages. The knowledge that wages can be recovered, effectually secures punctual payment without the resort to actual process of law, while this power in no way disturbs amicable relations between master and man. The experience that employers are now as a rule in the habit of paying wages punctually, would by no means induce the workmen to forego their legal claims. They would not think it just to be bound to spend their time and strength in working for their masters, and then be compelled to trust to their caprice or favour, or sense of honour alone, for the payment of their wages.

Yet we are unable to discover in what way the position of a man earning his livelihood by working for a master who supports him in return for his labour, differs as regards the question of right to maintenance from that of a woman who earns her bread by the performance of household duties for the husband who has undertaken to maintain her in return for her labour. If, when pay-day came round, the master were to inform the men that he had no money for them, as he had spent it all in selfish indulgence, and they would get nothing for that week's labour, the men would consider themselves unjustly treated. What, then, must the wife feel whose husband comes home on the Saturday night with his head full of drink and his pocket empty of cash? But the case of the wife is the harder of the two. The money she has a right to find in her husband's pockets at the end of the week is not hers for her personal use. It is the fund out of which she has to furnish food for her husband, her children, and herself. When that is wasted, their sustenance is gone.

A short time ago a lady was asked by a poor woman for a loan to pay off a debt at a provision shop for food supplied for the use of her family, consisting of her husband, herself, and three children. The husband was earning good wages, which he spent mostly in drink, and he did not give his wife enough even to provide the cost of his own food. The wife was obliged to go out to work, in order to earn money to pay for her own and her children's food, and make up the deficiency in that of her husband. The lady was advised not to lend the money, but to say

to the poor woman that her husband was legally liable for the debt incurred at the provision shop, and that the shopkeeper should sue him for it. The reply was, that the husband had threatened to strip the house and sell off every stick of furniture, and that if he were asked to pay the debt he would very probably carry his threat into effect. The furniture had not been provided by the husband; it had been bought with money advanced by the lady who was our informant, and repaid by the wife in weekly instalments out of her earnings. But as this transaction took place before the passing of the Married Women's Property Act of 1870, the husband would now be upheld by the majesty of the law in desolating his wife's home, the fruits of her honest industry.

The clergyman of a parish in Lancashire stated the case of one of his parishioners, the wife of a drunken, truculent collier, who is earning good wages, but who spends all on his own vicious indulgences, and gives his wife nothing for the maintenance of the household. Nevertheless he expects to be provided for at home, and kept "like a lord," as the clergyman said. The woman is industrious, clever, orderly, and a good manager. She contrives to earn enough to maintain a comfortable home and provide good meals for her legal master, who makes no scruple of abusing her if things are not served to his mind.

Such cases are very common; but were they as exceptional as they are common, they would afford ground for altering the law which supports and sanctions them.

The franchise is needed as a protection for women in regard of equal law. In every case where the laws determine the relative duties of men and women, the interest and the feelings of the unrepresented half of the nation have been made wholly subservient to that of the class which has political power. In the marriage relation, the wife's separate existence is lost; the husband is the only person recognised by the law. One of the most sacred natural rights, that of a mother to the child she has borne in her bosom, flesh of her flesh, bone of her bone, is set aside; and to the married mother's legal master is given the power to dispose of her offspring, not only during his lifetime but after his death. The law does not recognise a mother, even after her husband's death, as the natural guardian of her children. Her husband can will them away from her, and even if he names no other guardian, the mother does not become such by law. A married woman's children are not her own. Until a very few years ago an unweaned child might be torn from its mother's bosom, and deprived by a father's will of its mother's milk. However unnatural or bad a man might be, the law, without making any inquiries into his character, invested him

with irresponsible power to make such a decree, and sanctioned and enforced it effectively. One of the revising barristers who adjudicated on the claims of women to be put on the roll of electors, desiring to say something especially insulting and unpleasant to the claimant who came to plead in his court, stated that he declined to recognise suckling as a qualification for the suffrage. But if womanhood had not been a disqualification for the suffrage, it would have been impossible that for hundreds of years the law should have vested the right to the custody of an unweaned child in that parent who could not nourish it. This glaring anomaly has been partially remedied, but at the cost of an injustice which is almost more cruel than the original one. By Sir Thomas Talfourd's Custody of Infants Bill, passed soon after the accession of her present Majesty, the married mother is as a matter of grace kindly permitted to keep—not her children—oh no! the law does not recognise them as hers—but she is graciously allowed to keep her husband's children until they are seven years old. Why? that she may have all the care, trouble, and anxiety of their helpless infancy, and the—it may be—profligate father be relieved from the same, and the torture and the uprooting of her heart be all the more cruel at the end of the seven years, when the fiat of separation goes forth. What that torture is, none but a mother can know. It is probably the greatest that a human being can suffer. And the law sanctions the infliction of this torture on Englishwomen at the irresponsible will and pleasure of a man who may be a cruel and heartless scoundrel.

The despotic powers of a father are by no means a dead letter. But a short time ago a scene took place which shows what can be done, and what is done, under the sanction of man-made laws. The account went the round of the newspapers in a paragraph entitled

“PAINFUL SCENE IN A COURT OF JUSTICE.—In the Irish Court of Queen's Bench, Mr. Justice Fitzgerald had a *habeas corpus* application made by the Rev. Henry Newenham, to obtain custody of his two children, Adelaide and Edith, who were under the care of their mother, Lady Helena Newenham, and her father, Lord Mountcashel. His lordship ordered that the younger girl, a child of about seven years, should be delivered up to her father; but the other girl, who is nearly sixteen, the age at which she is legally a free agent, having already expressed her unwillingness to comply with her father's wish, was permitted to exercise her choice. A painful scene occurred as an officer came into the court, bearing the younger child, a pretty little girl, with long fair hair, and intelligent beyond her years. She screamed and struggled violently, exclaiming repeatedly, ‘Oh, must I, must I? Oh, dear, I won't go to my father.’ Mr. Justice Fitzgerald took her up and spoke kindly to her, telling her her father would be fond of



her, and that her mother would often see her. To this the child only replied again and again, 'Oh, please, do let me do as I like. Don't send me away. Will mamma ever see me again? Grandpa, grandpa, where are you?' Mr. Justice Fitzgerald: 'I shall take care of that, my dear. Your mamma will see you as often as she likes.' Child: 'Will it be every day? Tell me—will it be every day?' Mr. Justice Fitzgerald: 'Oh, yes, every day.' Lord Mountcashel (who was much moved): 'Knowing what I know, that is impossible. He is a d—l.' Mr. Justice Fitzgerald said: 'I am sorry I cannot leave the two sisters together. If I could, I would persuade you to that, Mr. Newenham. However, I hope you will allow free communication between the girls; and I must order that the mother be allowed to see her child as often as she wishes.' Mr. Purcell: 'Yes, my lord, all reasonable opportunity will be given her.' The child was then handed over to her father, who carried her out."

What a mockery to call the above a court of justice! A mother is to be "allowed" to see her child as often as she wishes, and a lawyer promises that all "reasonable opportunity" shall be given her. But suppose that on one of these reasonable opportunities on which the mother is "allowed to see" her child, she sees that the child is unhappy, or harshly treated, she cannot take it away, and the permission to "see" it may only add to her agony.

We appeal to every mother in the land to say, Is that mother and is that child justly treated by this country's law? Is it enough for those who are happy to say, "These laws, though unjust, are a dead letter in my case; therefore I take no care for these things?" As well might those who are warmed and fed allege their own sense of personal comfort as a reason why they should bestow no thought on the sufferings, or care for the relief of the cold, the hungry, and the naked. We ask all women who have happy homes to join us in trying to protect those women who have unhappy homes, or who have no homes. For it is only the happy who have strength to help. The unhappy are helpless entirely.

We thought it necessary before appealing to this condition of the law as an argument for the necessity of the franchise, to ascertain with more precision the state and animus of the law with regard to mothers. From a legal text-book which enters fully into this subject we gather that the fundamental principle of English law is, that the father alone is entitled to the custody and disposal of his children; that this right inheres totally irrespective of his moral character or fitness for the charge; and that it will be confirmed and enforced by the courts, though he be an open and notorious evil-liver. That while the law is thus jealous of the natural rights and parental feelings of the father, those of the mother are utterly disregarded; and that in the rare

instances in which the absolute power of the father in regard to the disposal of the children is restrained or modified by the action either of the judges or special application of the law relating to the custody of children under seven years of age, this is done not in consideration of the natural right or parental feelings of the *mother*, but solely out of care for the supposed interest of the *child*. The courts have specially and expressly disclaimed any other intention than that of interfering for the protection of the child, and the claims of the mother have been dismissed as altogether out of the consideration of the Court. Such modified rights to the custody of the babies as are permitted at the discretion of the judges to be conceded to a mother, are wholly forfeited if she has been guilty of adultery, while a father may be living in open adultery, yet may withhold the custody of her children from a virtuous mother. It seems so monstrous and incredible that so unjust a law should prevail, that we think the fact will scarcely be credited on assertion only. We will therefore offer to our readers some cases and decisions quoted by Mr. Macpherson, to set forth the state of the law:—

I.

“On the petition of a mother and her daughter, a child about fourteen years of age, praying that the daughter might be placed under the mother’s care, or that the mother might be permitted to have access to her daughter at all convenient times, it being stated at the bar that the father was living in habitual adultery, on account of which the mother had obtained a divorce in the Ecclesiastical Courts, Sir Anthony Host, L.C., said that the court had nothing to do with the fact of the father’s adultery; that some conduct on his part, with reference to the management and education of the child must be shown to warrant an interference with his legal right to the custody of his child. He did not know of any case which would authorize him to make the order sought. If any could be found, he would most gladly adopt it; for in a moral point of view he knew of no act more harsh or cruel than depriving the mother of proper intercourse with her child.”

II.

“The mother of three girls, the eldest aged five and a half years, left the house rented by her husband in which she was living with the infants, and afterwards removed them, and instituted proceedings in the Ecclesiastical Courts for a divorce. On the application of the father, a writ of *habeas corpus* was granted to bring the children before Mr. Justice Paterson. The judge ordered that the mother should deliver up the children to the husband. In this case it was stated that the father was living in adultery.”

III.

“An Englishwoman married a Frenchman domiciled in England. [Vol. XCVII. No. CXCI.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. XLI. No. I. F

She separated from her husband on account of ill-treatment, and he by force and stratagem got into the house where she was, and carried away her child, an infant at the breast. The mother obtained a *habeas corpus* upon affidavit, stating these facts. Lord Ellenborough said, 'The father is the person entitled by law to the custody of his child. If he abuse that right to the detriment of the child, the court will protect the child. But there is no pretence that the child has been injured for want of nurture, or in any other respect.' The child was remanded to the custody of the father."

## IV.

"G. H. Talbot, a Roman Catholic, married a Protestant lady. They had two children, John and Augusta. By a deed of separation between the parents, it was agreed that Augusta should remain with her mother till the age of ten. The father died, having by will appointed a Roman Catholic priest to be guardian of his children. The infants were made wards of court. The mother married Mr. Berkeley, a Protestant.

"A petition was presented on behalf of the infants, stating that the guardian had removed the boy, aged ten years, from school, and placed him under the care of his uncle, the Earl of Shrewsbury—that Lord Shrewsbury refused to allow him to visit his mother. The petition prayed that Augusta might continue with her mother, and that John might have unrestrained intercourse with his mother, and might reside with her for convenient periods.

"The guardian petitioned that Augusta might be delivered to him.

"The Lord Chancellor (Lord Cottenham) said that the *mother had no right to interfere with the testamentary guardian*. The Court would exercise a discretion whether an infant should be ordered to be delivered up to such guardian. The female infant was of the age of eight years and seven months, residing in her mother's house, under the care of a Roman Catholic governess, and there was strong evidence showing her to be of delicate constitution, and requiring the care of her mother. There was also a statement of the late father's wishes that she should be left in the care of her mother till the age of ten, and on that circumstance his lordship relied as evidence that she might safely be left with the mother till that period. He therefore left the female infant in the care of her mother. The petition of the guardian was ordered to stand over, no order being made upon it for the present. As to John Talbot, the Lord Chancellor said that it was right that he should live with Lord Shrewsbury. The petition of the infants was dismissed. The only access to her son which the guardian would afford to Mrs. Berkeley was at Lord Shrewsbury's house, and in the guardian's presence.

"Mrs. Berkeley petitioned that her son might be allowed to visit her for a month; the petition was accompanied with a medical certificate that she was in ill health owing to her anxiety to have access to her son.

"The Lord Chancellor felt it to be necessary to *look only to the interest of the infant, and to the wishes of the father*, expressed in his

appointment of a guardian, and declined to make any order on the petition. June 13, 1840."

V.

"A father applied to obtain possession of a child of five years old which the mother kept from him. There was reason to doubt whether the child was his; he had been divorced from the mother soon after its birth. Lord Kenyon had no doubt but that the father was entitled to the custody, as the Court saw no reason to believe that he intended to abuse his right by sacrificing the *child*."

VI.

"Lord Eldon, on *habeas corpus*, ordered two children of the respective ages of five years and seven months, to be delivered to their father by their mother, who was living apart from him, and who claimed their custody in virtue of a deed which provided for their residing with her in the event of a separation, and of another deed by which a provision was made for her separate maintenance, and an allowance was agreed to be paid her for the maintenance of the infants."

VII.

"In a modern case, in the Court of Common Pleas, a husband ill-treated his wife; a separation took place. The wife kept her child, which was six years old. The husband cohabited with another woman. The husband sued out a *habeas corpus*. The judge decided that neither the father nor the mother was entitled to the custody of the child, and it was given up to a third person."

The propositions which these cases illustrate are the following:—

The law vests parental rights in the father alone, to the entire exclusion of the mother. The father has power to remove children from their mother, not only during his life, but he may by will appoint a stranger to be guardian after his death, and such guardian may separate mother and child.

The power of the father is not forfeited by his immoral conduct. It inheres in him by law, and he cannot be divested of it at the discretion of a judge.

The Custody of Infants Act allowed some modified rights to mothers. But these rights are not conferred directly on any mother. They do not inhere in her by virtue of her motherhood; the Act is merely permissive. It declares that it shall be lawful for a judge, upon hearing a petition, *if he see fit*, to make an order that a mother shall be allowed access to her child, and if it is under seven years of age, to order that it be delivered to and remain in the custody of the mother until attaining that age, subject to such regulations as he shall deem convenient and just.

Another section of the Act declares that the judge shall have no power to make the order if the mother has been guilty of adultery.

The franchise is needed as a protection for women from the

uncontrolled dominion of the savage passions of men. In the less cultivated classes of society these passions rage with terrific violence, and their effects fall chiefly on the unhappy wives whom the law delivers up to the mercy of their legal masters. The existence of this savage element in our population will not be denied. Yet we will call two witnesses whose testimony is well calculated to arouse attention to this commonly acknowledged but commonly neglected fact. At the meeting of the British Association in Liverpool, after a lecture by Sir John Lubbock on "Savages," Professor Huxley, in the course of some observations, said :—

"Since I have walked in your great town of Liverpool I have seen fully as many savages, as degraded savages as those in Australia. Nay, worse; in the primitive savage there remains a certain manliness derived from lengthened contact with nature and struggle with it, which is absent in these outcast and degraded children of civilization. The people who form what are called the upper strata of society talk of political questions as if they were questions of Whig or Tory, of Conservative and Heaven knows what, but the man who can see, will, I think, believe that in these times there lies beneath all these questions the great question whether that prodigious misery which dogs the footsteps of modern civilization shall be allowed to exist—whether, in fact, in the heart of the most polished nations of the present day—of those nations which pride themselves most on being Christians—there shall be this predominant and increasing savagery, of which such abundant instances are in your midst. I believe that this is the great political question of the future."

We agree with the eminent Professor in this belief, and we ask—Have not women the deepest interest in, and is it not their duty to care for, political questions such as this? For women, and notably the women of our own land, are the chief victims of this savagery. There is not, we believe, any class in the world so subjected to brutal personal violence as English wives.

Soon after these remarks of Professor Huxley at Liverpool, Mr. Justice Brett held the winter assizes at Manchester. The following are extracts from his charge to the grand jury :—

"The calendar is not long, but I am sorry to say it is serious, and this seems to me to arise principally from a habit of brutal violence, and giving way, without the smallest provocation, to evil passions. There are no fewer than four persons accused of murder, and there are many cases of violence by stabbing and by cutting with knives. . . . The first case is No. 1 in the calendar, and it is the case of a man who is accused of the murder of his wife. According to the depositions, by his own confession, he went in without any particular ill-feeling to this woman. The principal evidence against him is his own child. He put a rope round his wife's neck, tied it with a knot under her ear, and dragged her about the room until she was dead. . . .

"The next case is No. 6 on the list. It is also that of a man charged with the murder of his wife. In this case no one was present when the blow was struck, but the man was seen going into his house, a scream was heard, and the woman was seen coming out holding her apron to her head, the blood streaming profusely from a severe wound in the head. There was a brush or part of a broom found on the floor, and the woman made a statement in the prisoner's presence that he struck her with the broom. When she was examined by the doctors it was found that her skull was crushed in, and she was seized with paralysis and died. . . .

"The next case is No. 27. This, again, is the case of a man who is charged with the murder of a woman with whom he lived as his wife. There is evidence that he struck the woman a blow. . . .

"Another case is that of a man who killed his wife; and here, again, the blow was not seen, but the man was seen going into the house, and shortly afterwards the woman was seen bleeding about the head, and several contused wounds were afterwards found on her person. She seems to have died from what the doctors call prostration and weakness from exhaustion; and in presence of the man she said he not only struck her with a poker, but stamped upon her after having knocked her down. . . . How terrible this is! Here are no fewer than four cases in which men are charged with wilful murder, with brutal violence to women with whom they lived as their wives. Some steps must be taken to put an end to such conduct."

Men say that women are not oppressed. But women themselves tell a different tale. From all parts of the country, from suffering and sorrowing women, come voices blessing the efforts that are made and bidding them God-speed. Sometimes they come from the ranks of the peerage—sometimes from the well-to-do middle classes—sometimes from the poorest of the poor. From all sorts and conditions of women the cry of distress has gone forth. And the story is ever the same deep and cruel wrong, suffered at the hands of those who in theory are their natural protectors. All have the same hopeless consciousness that for them there is no help and no redress. They are made legally subordinate to men, and their sufferings are held as of no account.

We are persuaded that the sufferings and the wrongs of women will never be considered worthy of attention by the Legislature until they are in possession of the suffrage, and not until they are politically on the same level as men, will their education and their welfare receive equal care from the Government. All those who are interested in the general progress of society in intelligence and virtue should aid in the effort to remove the political disabilities of half the nation. When this shall be accomplished the additional power thereby gained will enable those who are working for measures of social and political reform

to carry them on at a rate of progress hitherto undreamed of. At present half the people are excluded from participation in matters of national interest, and of the privileged half a great portion are held back by want of public spirit, of knowledge, and of interest in these matters. This apathy is the natural result of the influence of the huge mass of political ignorance, partly engendered by the exclusion of women from political existence. Remove the cause, and the effect will begin to diminish; enfranchise the whole people, and the whole people will begin to develop political life. In a celebrated *Essay on the Education of the World*, the writer has personified the human race under the figure of a colossal man, whose infancy, education, and growth represent the development of religious and political civilization throughout the period of authentic history. If we can imagine this man determining that his right leg alone must have the advantage of exercise, and the left should be regarded as an ornamental appendage, it will not inaptly figure the attempt of humanity to make progress by cultivating only one sex. All who have turned their energies to public affairs feel how lame and imperfect is the advance of opinion on great questions, and in the suppression of intelligent and responsible opinion in women we find the cause of this lethargy.



#### ART. IV.—THE FIRST EARL OF SHAFTESBURY.

*A Life of Anthony Ashley Cooper, First Earl of Shaftesbury, 1621–1683.* By W. D. CHRISTIE, M.A., formerly Her Majesty's Minister to the Argentine Confederation and to Brazil. 2 Vols. London and New York: Macmillan and Co. 1871.

IT is perhaps the peculiar boast of England—and in a secondary degree the boast of the United States—that works of great research, labour, and learning have been produced in either country by men belonging to the leisured class, who wrote not for gain, but for pure love of the subjects which employed their pens. To a list which includes the distinguished names of Stanhope, Grote, Motley, and Prescott, may be now added that of Mr. W. D. Christie, who has devoted the *horas subsecivas* of official life and the leisure of retirement to an illustration of the lives of two Carolinian celebrities, John Dryden and Anthony, Earl of Shaftesbury.

It is true enough that in any society of average Englishmen very few will be found who know much about Dryden or care anything for Shaftesbury. Yet the times in which these men flourished were amongst the most strange and stirring in the history of England; the parts played by both conspicuous and pronounced; the mark which one made on the history of his day only less than the impression which the other made on its literature, as the work of the statesman must always be less enduring than that of the poet. Both of these men have left a lasting mark on England. The one gave us the Habeas Corpus Act; the other, in "*Absalom and Achitophel*" and the "*Hind and Panther*," bequeathed to English rhyme a finish, point, and terseness, at once a vigour and a smoothness, which made French models thenceforth superfluous, and inspired the future rivalry of Pope.

And the age in which they both lived is amongst the most interesting and perplexing in the annals of our country. To one who looks back on it from the age of Queen Victoria, it seems much as the tortuous defiles of the Alps seem in the recollection of the traveller who has effected a safe descent on the rich and sunny plains of Lombardy. Unreasonable combinations and unreasonable hostilities; violent hatreds and unaccountable reconciliations; profound suspicions and open-hearted credulity; the grossest corruption and the most sublime self-devotion—all these jostle one another like the many-coloured images of a kaleidoscope. The contrast of the age of Charles II. with the age which preceded it, of the men of his reign with the men of the Protectorate, of his foreign policy with that of Cromwell, gives to the history of his time and his ministers the interest of an historical puzzle; and perhaps no one statesman of the period exemplifies its peculiarities more vividly than the one whom Mr. Christie has undertaken not only to justify but to praise.

Anthony Ashley Cooper was born in 1621, the nineteenth year of the reign of James I. His father was Sir John Cooper, of Rockborne, in Hampshire. His mother was the only daughter of Sir Anthony Ashley, of Wimborne St. Giles, in Dorsetshire. As he said of himself, "My parents on both sides of a noble stock, being of the first rank of gentry in those counties where they lived." Young Cooper was christened Anthony Ashley by the express desire of his maternal grandfather, who had stipulated that the lad should bear the name of Ashley along with that of his father. When he was seven years old he lost his mother. Three years after that he lost his father, who had married a second wife, Lady Morrison, daughter of Sir Baptist Hicks. Lord Campbell speaks of Anthony Ashley as being, while a



boy, a baronet with 8000*l.* a year. He was indeed left rich ; but he was rich after considerable losses. He inherited estates held of the Crown by tenure of knight-service, and therefore under the control of the Court of Wards. His grandfather's brother, Sir Francis Ashley, who, as King's Serjeant, had considerable influence with that Court, showed himself less than kind to his young kinsman, for he obtained a decree by means of which some of the estates were sold to himself and others much below their value. Nor was this the only wrong attempted by this unjust grand-uncle. He endeavoured to bring other property of his nephew within the jurisdiction of the Court of Wards, over which it had no legal control. The design was thwarted by the courage and address of the intended victim. Young Cooper went to Noy, the Attorney-General, who had drawn the deed of his mother's settlement, and succeeded in persuading that powerful lawyer to be his advocate in the Court of Wards. The issue of this application is thus narrated in Shaftesbury's own words :—

"My Lord Cottington was then Master of the Wards, who, sitting with his hat over his eyes, and having heard Sir Francis make a long and elegant speech for the overthrowing of my deed, said openly, 'Sir Francis, you have spoke like a good uncle.' Mr. Attorney Noy argued for me, and my uncle rising up to reply (I being then present in Court), before he could speak two words, he was taken with a sudden convulsion fit, his mouth drawn to his ear, was carried out of the Court, and never spoke more."\*

After all, as Mr. Christie estimates, Ashley lost about 1600*l.* a year, and still remained rich. He had, as he himself relates, "hawks and hounds" of his own. After spending his boyhood in the families of relatives and trustees, and under the care of three successive tutors, he was sent to Oxford at the age of sixteen, where he entered at Exeter College. It was his boast that he had "learned the world faster than his book," and his own account of his college days justifies the boast. The following extract from his autobiographical fragment testifies equally to the ease of his circumstances and his self-complacency :—

---

\* "Sir Richard Baker notes Sir F. Ashley's death as, 'by the will of God,' November 20, 1635. (*Chronicle*, p. 417, ed. 1684.) Noy, who was made Attorney-General in January 1634, died August 9, 1635. (*Howel's Letters*, i. 241; *Notes and Queries*, 1st Ser. i. 211.) There must therefore be a mistake in Baker's date of Sir F. Ashley's death. Sir F. Ashley was a conspicuous defender of the arbitrary system of Charles I., and was committed to custody by the House of Lords in 1628, on account of the violence with which he argued at the bar of that House for the Crown, against the Petition of Right."

"I kept both horses and servants in Oxford, and was allowed what expense or recreation I desired, which liberty I never much abused; but it gave me the opportunity of obliging by entertainments the better sort, and supporting divers of the activest of the lower rank with giving them leave to eat, when in distress, upon my expense, it being no small honour among those sort of men that my name in the buttery-book willingly bore twice the expense of any in the University. This expense, my quality, proficiency in learning, and natural affability, easily not only obtained the good-will of the wiser and elder sort, but made me the leader even of all the rough young men of that college, famous for the courage and strength of tall raw-boned Cornish and Devonshire gentlemen, which in great number yearly come to that college, and did then maintain in the schools coursing against Christchurch, the largest and most numerous college in the University."\*

What schoolboys they were in those days the more thoughtful and serious students of modern Oxford may gather from the following extract. It was at that time

"a foolish custom of great antiquity, that one of the seniors in the evening called the freshmen (which are such as came since that time twelvemonth) to the fire, and made them hold out their chin, and then with the nail of their right thumb, left long for that purpose, grate off all the skin from the lip to the chin, and then cause them to drink a beer-glass of water and salt. The time approaching when I should be thus used, I considered that it had happened in that year, more and lustier young gentlemen had come to the college than had done in several years before, so that the freshmen was a very strong body. Upon this I consulted my two cousin-germans, the Tookers, my aunt's sons, both freshmen, both stout and very strong, and several others, and at last the whole party were cheerfully engaged to stand stoutly to defence of their chins. We all appeared at the fires in the hall, and my Lord of Pembroke's son calling me first, as we knew by custom it would begin with me, I, according to agreement, gave the signal, striking him a box on the ear, and immediately the freshmen fell on, and we easily cleared the buttery and the hall; but bachelors and young masters coming in to assist the seniors, we were compelled to retreat to a ground chamber in the quadrangle. They pressing at the door, some of the stoutest and strongest of our freshmen, giant-like boys, opened the doors, let in as many as they pleased, and shut the door by main strength against the rest; those let in they fell upon, and had beaten very severely, but that my authority with them stopped them, some of them being considerable enough to make terms for us, which they did."

Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper left Oxford before taking his degree; and, while yet only eighteen, married a daughter of Lord Keeper Coventry in 1639, and thus became connected with

---

\* "Fragment of Autobiography."

two distinguished statesmen of Charles II.'s reign, of whom the poet Marvell wrote :—

“ All the two Coventries their generals chose,  
For one had much, the other nought to lose.  
Not better choice all accidents could hit,  
While hector Harry steers by Will the wit.”

After his marriage he lived with his father-in-law in the Strand and at Islington, whence he made excursions to his native place, Wimborne St. Giles, and there cultivated the friendship of his Dorsetshire neighbours. His connexion with the Coventrys combined with his own birth and position to ingratiate him with the leading families; and the advantages which he had acquired from fortune were further improved by his cheerfulness and pluck. He was even in his youth far from strong, and therefore unable to prosecute those hardy exercises in which his temperament led him to indulge. But his natural readiness enabled him to turn this physical infirmity to good account. Having accompanied his brother-in-law on a visit into Worcestershire, he went out hunting. A spasm of pain came on and prevented him from keeping up with the rest of the field. He lagged behind, and found that the Bailiffs of Tewkesbury were the companions of his ride. This acquaintance laid the foundation of his political career. How it did this may be best told in his own words :—

“ At dinner the Bailiffs sat at the table's end; Sir Harry Spiller and myself, opposite to one another, sat near them, but one betwixt. Sir Harry began the dinner with all the affronts and dislikes he could put on the Bailiffs or their entertainment, which enraged and discountenanced them and the rest of the town that stood behind us; and the more, it being in the face of the best gentlemen of the country, and when they resolved to appear in their best colours. When the first course was near spent, and he continued his rough raillery, I thought it my duty, eating their bread, to defend their cause the best I could, which I did with so good success, not sparing the bitterest retorts I could make him, which his way in the world afforded matter for, that I had a perfect victory over him. This gained the townsmen's hearts, and their wives' to boot; I was made free of the town, and the next parliament, though absent, without a penny charge, was chosen Burgess by an unanimous vote.”

He was elected in 1640, before he had completed his nineteenth year. The illegality of this early election, as Mr. Christie points out, was shared by others. “ At one time in James's reign there were counted fourteen members under age.” Some of these were under sixteen. The poet Waller sat when he was only sixteen. “ Monk's son is said to have been only fourteen

when he took part in a debate on Lord Clarendon's impeachment."

This Parliament was convoked under grave and momentous circumstances. Eleven years had now passed since the last Parliament was summoned. The interval had witnessed many memorable events: the death of Sir John Eliot in prison; the imposition of ship money; Hampden's resistance; Laud's Popish innovations in the English Church; and a religious revolt in Scotland. Naturally, the new House insisted on the redress of grievances before granting supplies. It was equally natural on the part of Charles to dissolve it in three weeks. Its existence was too short to admit of any display on the part of Anthony Ashley Cooper, and it is not clear on which side he voted. It does not seem unreasonable to suppose that if he took any part at all, it was on the King's side; and this assumption is rendered more probable, if Mr. Christie's conjecture be true, that the voters of Tewkesbury favoured the Puritan party, for at the next election, which took place six months later, he was not re-elected for that borough, but presented himself as a candidate for Downton, a borough in Wiltshire, near his own estate. Here there was a double return, and he petitioned; but there was no report of a Committee, and no decision of the House for twenty years. In 1660 he got the seat for Downton which he had claimed in 1640! Thus he never was a Member of the Long Parliament at all. When the great conflict between the King and the Parliament began, Cooper was a spectator of Charles's camp at Nottingham. In the spring of 1643 he attached himself openly to the King's side, and received from the Marquis of Hertford commissions as colonel of a foot regiment and captain of a troop of cavalry in the Royal Army. He also received his commission as prospective Governor of Weymouth and Portland as soon as they should fall into the King's hands. Prince Maurice, who succeeded Hertford in the command of the Western Army, was ordered to annul his predecessor's nomination; but, on the intervention of the King, confirmed, or rather allowed it. The fact seems to have been that both the King and the Prince considered Cooper too young for the office, and that both began to recognise the disadvantage of entrusting military commands to country gentlemen who made no pretensions to military skill and experience. Cooper did not long retain either his commission as Governor or his office of Sheriff. Whether he was, as Lord Clarendon suggests, piqued by the slight which Prince Maurice had put on him, or foresaw the unhappy fate of the Royal arms, or—as he states himself—perceived the King's aim to be "destructive to religion and the State," may be open questions. He certainly resigned all his

commissions, and presented himself before the Committee of both Kingdoms in the early part of 1644. Mr. Christie, who is inspired by true biographical zeal, is anxious to defend him from the imputation of interested motives by reminding us that he left much of his property at the King's mercy. To this it may be replied, that Cooper never lacked shrewdness, and that even at this stage of the conflict he may have discerned the probability of the Parliamentary success. It is likely that he was actuated, not solely by selfish views, but by mixed motives, equally compounded of self-interest, pique, patriotism, and ambition.

The Parliament to which Cooper gave his support was very different from that of 1640, which Charles had so rashly dissolved. It had excluded the Bishops from the House of Lords; it had conferred the privilege of perpetuity on itself; it had assumed some high military prerogatives of the Crown to itself; it had tried to grasp others; it had concluded the "Solemn League and Covenant" with the Scotch Parliament. It represented not only the constitutional and religious feeling, but also much of the wealth and property of the kingdom. In numbers and in earnestness it excelled its nominal rival which the King summoned to his aid at Oxford. At its hands Cooper now received a commission to command a brigade of horse and foot, with the grandiose title of "Field-Marshal General!" His first military exploit was to take Wareham, defended by Colonel O'Brien. Next, he was appointed Commander-in-Chief of the Parliamentary forces in Dorsetshire, in which capacity he stormed the Cavalier garrison at Abbotsbury, and afterwards drove the Royalists out of Sturminster and Shaftesbury. Thence he proceeded to the relief of Blake at Taunton, and compelled the besiegers to raise the siege. After 1644 his military services seem to have become fewer and less important, and in 1645 they came to an end, just as the command of the army passed from Presbyterian to Independent officers. He now repeated his attempt to secure his seat for Downton. A motion was made in the House, and Sir W. Erle was ordered to report on his petition. But no report seems to have been made upon it, and Cooper remained out of Parliament. The seven or eight years which ensued were signalized by the most momentous events in the history of England. They witnessed the triumph of the Parliament over the Crown, and of the Army over the Parliament, the execution of the King, and the elevation of Cromwell. Yet Cooper remained inactive all this time, and of the events which were passing around him not a hint is to be found in his diary. It certainly is a curious peculiarity of character that a man who always took a great interest in the political questions

of the day, and had, while very young, taken a prominent part in a most grave political conflict, should keep a diary in which he recorded the gossip of the neighbourhood, the sentences at the Assizes, the prescriptions for his own and his wife's ailments, and did not record any of the stirring incidents of the most momentous crisis in the constitutional history of England. We hope Mr. Christie will acquit us of malevolence, but we can hardly resist the suspicion that Cooper wrote his diary for the perusal of others than his own family, and that his natural shrewdness forbade the expression of opinions, the publication of which might provoke the premature hostility of any of the contending factions against himself. In July of 1649 this diary records the death of his wife, with a most tender eulogium on her character; and one of the last entries in it, nine months later, relates his marriage to Lady F. Cecil, sister of the royalist Earl of Exeter.

At this time that remnant of the Long Parliament which survived the execution of the King—vulgarly called the Rump—was drawing to a close. Its ultimate extinction was hastened by its own discussion as to the time and mode of its termination. It was, indeed, strange that a fragment of an Assembly, which owed its existence to the toleration of a dominant Army, should have lasted so long. Now its hour was come. While it was, in April, 1653, passing a Bill for the regulation of its own successors, the Lord General entered with two files of musketeers, and bade the members be all gone. The Speaker, according to one account, was "plucked out" by two soldiers; according to another, was "sweetly and kindly" taken by the hand and "led out of the Chair." The House was dissolved, and, in June, was succeeded by an Assembly of one hundred and forty-two persons, nicknamed Barebone's Parliament. In this odd and heterogeneous gathering Sir A. A. Cooper sat as one of the ten Members for Wiltshire. He was also added to the thirty persons who now composed the Council of State. On the 10th December the new Parliament, after a session of squabbles and prayers, resigned its powers into the hands of Cromwell. What part Cooper had in the discussion which preceded this resignation does not appear, neither what part he took in its general proceedings. Mr. Christie is probably right when he defends his hero from the charge of having participated in the spiritual exercises of the fanatical mechanics who conferred on this Parliament its special notoriety. Dryden, it is true, virulently assailed him in later years as a hypocrite,—

"Bartering his venal wit for sums of gold,  
He cast himself into the saint-like mould;  
Groaned, sighed, and prayed while godliness was gain,  
The loudest bagpipe of the squeaking train."

But had he really prayed or groaned with the Stand-in-the-faith Nathaniels, or the Saved-from-the-fire Nehemiahs of the Conventicle, it would surely have been generally remembered to his discredit at a later period when he took an active and conspicuous part as a Parliamentary leader on the great questions of civil and religious liberty. Impulsiveness, rather than hypocrisy, was, at all times of his life, the leading feature of Cooper's character ; and his ardent temperament, which often resembled enthusiasm, was displayed in political, rather than religious heats.

The dissolution of the Parliament was followed by the Instrument of Government, which made Cromwell Lord High Protector, reformed the constitution of Parliament on the basis which was imitated in our own day, and established a Council of State, of which Cooper was made a member, and wherein John Milton was one of his colleagues. Many moderate men wished to see the Crown conferred on Cromwell, and among these was Cooper ; but the name of "King" stunk in the nostrils of the root-and-branch men of the Army, and Cromwell could do nothing against its will. Mr Christie quotes a curious passage from Bishop Burnet, to the effect that Cromwell offered to make him King. Probably the origin of the story was some grim piece of humour on the Protector's part when Cooper tried to persuade him to assume the Crown, or, more probably even, a piece of mystification played off by Cooper on Burnet. But there is not one single reason for believing that such a proposal was ever seriously made by Cromwell to Cooper.

In the Parliament convoked under the Instrument of Government, Cooper sat again for Wiltshire. This House, from its beginning, gave trouble to the Protector. After his opening speech, the members began to discuss the very principle of the existing Government. The debate lasted four days in "Grand Committee ;" and when the Committee broke up, there seemed every likelihood of its passing a resolution declaring the Government to be "in a single person limited and restrained as the Parliament should think fit." The firmness of the Protector was sufficient for the emergency. The next morning members found the doors of the House locked, and were ordered to meet the Protector in the Painted Chamber. When he came, he read them a lecture on their insubordination in venturing to upset the personal government of the country, and warned them that he should exact from them a promise not to repeat the offence. On their return they found the doors still locked, and an officer standing with a declaration of obedience, which each member was to sign. In the end, the declaration was signed as required. But the ingenuity of the members managed to override this barrier. The Instrument of Government was debated in the

whole House. The first clause, which placed the chief government in the hands of a single person, was left untouched, according to the terms of the declaration; but the others were amended in a sense offensive to Cromwell's pride and adverse to his power. Cromwell was not to be thus thwarted. The Parliament was, by its constitution, not to be dissolved under five months. Cromwell chose to construe this as meaning lunar months. The Parliament had sat five months of twenty-eight days, and he dissolved it. A month before its dissolution, Sir A. Ashley Cooper retired from the Council, or was ejected from it. The causes of either contingency are unknown. Among those which are conjectured is one of a domestic nature. Cooper had again become a widower, and was said to have unsuccessfully aspired to the hand of the "Lady Mary," Cromwell's daughter, who married Lord Fauconbridge. This explanation is not impossible, but it wants confirmation. It is more probable that Cooper, who throughout life exhibited such a quick perception of popular feeling, had detected a growing dislike to Cromwell's government, and feared to hazard his own safety or popularity by adhering to it. Whatever may have been the disappointments of his courtship, he repaired or consoled them by a third marriage. His next wife was the daughter of the second Lord Spencer of Wormleighton. She bore him no children, but lavished the affection of a mother on Cooper's son by his second wife, and again watched over the infancy of that stepson's child, who became celebrated in after years as the author of "Characteristics," and whom a popular author of our day has oddly confounded with his grandfather, the subject of this work.

On the meeting of the new Parliament, Cooper was again elected for Wiltshire, but Cromwell would not allow him to take his seat. The Instrument of Government had made the approbation of the Council a condition precedent to admission into Parliament. Cooper, who had ceased to be a member of the former body, was now excluded by it from the latter. He then, in conjunction with others in the same position, addressed a remonstrance to the Speaker. The upshot was a contumelious reply on the part of the Council, that they had not refused certificates to such as "were persons of known integrity, fearing God, and of good conversation." Sir A. A. Cooper and many others were compelled to submit to this reply and to their exclusion from Parliament. This House proved more manageable than some of its predecessors. It presented the "Humble Petition and Advice," the two main objects of which were to confer the Crown on Cromwell, and to restore a House of Lords. Cromwell refused the Crown and remained Protector, but the House of Peers was re-established.



Mr. Christie says that Sir A. A. Cooper's name was not in Cromwell's list, and that the Protector had now no hope of gaining him. It does not appear to us that there was any very strong motive why Cromwell should be anxious to gain him. He does not appear to have been either so useful in Council or so formidable out of Council that he should be specially soothed or courted. He was not in Parliament. His opposition was not of a very powerful kind, and his partisanship, on whatever side he ranged himself, was liable to vary with his caprices or his fears. Cooper was a baronet with 8000*l.* a year, and such men, however vain or ambitious they may be, do not stake their all, in troublous times, on the fortunes of a faction or of a man. Cromwell's position was too strong to be resolutely attacked by such a force as Cooper could bring against it; and it was not strong enough to fire his enthusiasm or enlist his devotion in its behalf.

In January of the next year, 1658, Cooper took his seat with the other excluded members. At the opening of the Session the ears of the audience were struck by the disused words, "My Lords and Gentlemen." The Commons began to take exception to the restoration of the Upper House on the arrival of a message from the Lords. In vain Cromwell sent for them and exhorted them to union. They continued to debate this innovation on the constitution of the Government till they were dissolved. In these debates Cooper took a prominent part. He was for having a "Grand Committee" on the powers and privileges of the other House. His speeches are very meagrely reported. The extracts read like the random notes of an illiterate pressman. Whatever Cooper's views were with respect to the new Peers, they were not now so strongly expressed as they were in the following year. But the opposition offered by himself and others irritated Cromwell so that he dissolved the Parliament within a month after he had convoked it. Cromwell never convoked another, for he died seven months after its dissolution. Richard, his son, whom he had named as his successor, and who was recognised by the Council, called a new Parliament in January, 1659. The constitution of the Lower House reverted to the form which existed previous to the "Instrument of Government," and the Lords were summoned also. Cooper took his seat for Poole, and became a prominent leader of the opposition. Animated debates took place on the question whether Richard should be "recognised" or "declared" Protector. On a resolution being proposed "saving the rights of Parliament," Cooper spoke with a vigour and resolution which we do not trace in his speeches under the more powerful sway of Oliver. The next great question was, whether the House would

transact with the other House as with a House of Parliament. In this debate Cooper delivered a speech against Oliver's Peers. The speech, as published, is full of vigorous acrimony, but whether it was ever spoken as published may be doubted. The following extracts show its force and its bitterness :—

“That which we deliberate is not whether we will say, we do not care to be free, we like our old masters, and will be content to have our ears bored at the door-post of their House, and to serve them for ever ; but, Sir, as if we were contending for shame as well as servitude, we are carrying our ears to be bored at the doors of another House ; an House, Sir, without a name, and therefore it is but congruous it should consist of members without family ; an House that inverts the order of slavery, and subjects us to our servants ; and yet, in contradiction to Scripture, we do not only not think that subjection intolerable, but we are now pleading for it. In a word, Sir, it is a House of so incongruous and odious a composition and mixture, that certainly the grand architect would never have so framed it, had it not been his design, as well to show the world the contempt he had of us, as to demonstrate the power he had over us.”

Again, the following description, if really spoken, must have sounded racy in the ears of many :—

“What I shall speak of their quality, or anything else concerning them, I would be thought to speak with distinction, and to intend only of the major part ; for I acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, the mixture of the other House to be like the composition of apothecaries, who mix something grateful to the taste to qualify their bitter drugs, which else, perhaps, would be immediately spit out and never swallowed. So, Sir, his Highness of deplorable memory to this nation, to countenance as well the want of quality as of honesty in the rest, has nominated some against whom there lies no other reproach but only that nomination ; but not out of any respect to their quality or regard to their virtues, but out of regard to the no-quality, the no-virtues of the rest ; which truly, Mr. Speaker, if he had not done, we could easily have given a more express name to this other House than he hath been pleased to do : for we know a house designed for beggars and malefactors is a house of correction, and so termed by our law ; but, Mr. Speaker, setting those few persons aside, who, I hope, think the nomination a disgrace—and their ever coming to sit there a much greater—can we without indignation think of the rest ? He, who is first in their roll, a condemned coward ; one that out of fear and baseness did once what he could to betray our liberties, and now does the same for gain.\* The second, a person of as little sense as honesty,

---

\* “Nathaniel Fiennes, second son of Viscount Saye and Sele, who had, in the beginning of the Civil War, surrendered Bristol to the King's army without making any defence, and had been condemned to death by a court-martial but pardoned by the Earl of Essex, the General-in-Chief. He was now First Commissioner of the Great Seal, and one of Richard Cromwell's

preferred for no other reason but his no-worth, his no-conscience; except cheating his father of all he had was thought a virtue by him, who by sad experience we find hath done as much for his mother—his country. The third, a Cavalier, a Presbyterian, an Independent; for the Republic, for a Protector, for everything, for nothing, but only that one thing—money.\* It were endless, Sir, to run through them all; to tell you of the lordships of seventeen pounds a year land of inheritance; of the farmer lordships, draymen lordships, cobbler lordships,† without one foot of land but what the blood of Englishmen has been the price of. These, Sir, are to be our rulers, these the judges of our lives and fortunes; to these we are to stand bare, whilst their pageant lordships deign to give us a conference on their breeches. Mr. Speaker, we have already had too much experience how insupportable servants are when they become our masters. All kinds of slavery are miserable in the account of generous minds; but that which comes accompanied with scorn and contempt stirs up every man's indignation, and is endured by none whom nature does not intend for slaves as well as fortune."

These quotations reflect but little credit on Cooper's consistency or good feeling. He had been a supporter of the Protector and his government; had held office under him; had been the intimate friend of his son Henry; was supposed to have been the suitor for the hand of his daughter. Yet the great man is scarcely cold in his grave before Cooper assails him with this scurrilous abuse. It is difficult to say which is the more astonishing, the ingratitude or the impudence of this speech. Not only had Cooper been a friend of Cromwell, but he had worn the colours of every party in the State, Cavalier and Republican, Presbyterian and Independent. And now the faculty of "ratting" which he himself had signally illustrated, he unblushingly condemned. It is impossible, when reading such passages in Cooper's life, not to feel how much truth there is in Dryden's satire:

"Sagacious, bold, and turbulent of wit;  
Restless, unfixed in principles and place,  
In power unpleas'd, impatient of disgrace."

There is one epithet here which perhaps ought to be changed. Shaftesbury was restless, impatient, irritable, and capricious. But he can hardly be said to have been always "bold." Whatever

chief advisers. His father and a younger brother, John, were also named by Cromwell members of the House of Lords: the father did not sit."

\* "Supposed to be Lord Broghill, after the Restoration created Earl of Orrery; a poet and play-writer, as well as a versatile and ambitious politician."

† "Colonel Pride, one of the lords, had been a brewer, and is said to have begun as a drayman; and Colonel Hewson, another lord, had been a shoemaker."

boldness he did possess was, in the earlier stages of his career, tempered by discretion. He generally measured the vehemence of his language by the impunity of its utterance. A few months earlier, his disapproval of the Restoration and the shiftiness of politicians would have been touched with delicate and cautious wit. Now, the Protectorate and time-servers might safely be cauterized in terms of uncompromising indignation. And so through life. Although on many occasions Cooper's vanity, impatience, and irritability prevented him from reaping all the fruits of his energy and capacity, it was only towards the close of his career that his indiscretion threatened him with serious danger. He was often indiscreet, but this did not damage either his fortune or his position. On the contrary, one was improved, while the other was not impaired, by a very turbulent and restless prominence in public affairs during a very turbulent and restless epoch of our national history.

After an animated debate the Commons affirmed the following resolution, "That this House will transact with the persons now sitting in the other House as a House of Parliament during this present Parliament, and that it is not hereby intended to exclude such Peers as have been faithful to the Parliament, from their privilege of being duly summoned as members of that House."

Next came the question of settling a revenue on Richard Cromwell. Cooper resisted a proposal to this effect, but unsuccessfully. He was more successful in carrying a resolution that after the termination of that Parliament no tax should be in force without the distinct and special sanction of the House.

Meanwhile, the clouds were gathering on the horizon. The House of Commons and the House of Lords were squabbling about forms. But there was a power in the country greater than that of Lords and Commons. That power was the army, which looked with contemptuous indignation at the temper which could debate forms and ceremonies, bowings and salutations, messengers and messages, while its own claims were treated with indifference. The officers had been accustomed to sit in council under Fleetwood's presidency at Wallingford House, and here they framed resolutions recommending the transfer of the military command to some one in whom they had confidence. These resolutions were insolent and menacing, and Richard appealed to Parliament, which passed two other resolutions imposing on all military officers oaths of allegiance to the Protector. These were sent up to the Lords. While the Lords were debating them, Richard assumed an air of firmness, and dissolved the Council of Wallingford. Fleetwood and Desborough defied his authority and demanded the dissolution of the Parliament. Richard was too weak to resist; he submitted; Parliament

was dissolved; and the fate of Richard's Protectorate was sealed.

Not that the two generals, Desborough and Fleetwood, were hostile to Richard's civil supremacy. They were, on the contrary, bound to his person and his interests by ties of affinity. One was the husband of his sister, the other of his aunt. Their object was limited to curtailing his military authority. But like many other general officers who seek to attain certain ends of their own in times of disorder or unsettled government, they reckoned without their host. Their army had views very different from theirs. The men and many of the officers were for the most part of the stern stuff which had formed the iron ranks of Oliver, grim Republicans who hated Prelacy only a degree more than they hated Monarchy. The Council of Officers would not hear of tolerating the personal rule of Richard. Ultimately it was proposed to restore the Rump, and the proposal became a resolution. A declaration inviting those members who had continued their sittings after the execution of Charles I. was presented to the old Speaker Lenthall. On the 7th May, 1659, the army of Richard brought back the Speaker and a portion of the Rump to the seats from which the army of Oliver had ousted them. Cooper eagerly sought to establish his seat in the restored House for the borough of Downton. He petitioned; but at first his petition was either rejected or postponed. Probably his many tergiversations subjected him to the suspicion of the dominant party. But, though excluded from the House, he was admitted into the Council of State, as one of the ten non-Parliamentary members. His election caused great surprise, but is not wholly inexplicable. Already men's minds were wavering between different forms of government. The English army was, as we have seen, violently Republican. It is not likely that the country gentry and men of substance sympathized with it. The weakness of Richard only suggested some stronger and more enduring form of government. Such thoughts might not safely find expression at the time, but they would lead men to revolve the means of bringing about a reactionary revolution. If there was any likelihood of effecting a change, there were no better instruments to employ for the purpose than men whose natural restlessness was modified by a discreet perception of the best opportunity for changing. Such a man was Sir A. A. Cooper, and doubtless he owed his seat in the Council to the same suspicions which kept him from a seat in Parliament. He vehemently repelled the charge of being in correspondence with the exiled King; and we believe his assertion. But it is quite consistent with this denial that he should discern the temper of the times, and be prepared to conform his actions to the tenor of

opinion. And it is not unlikely that he may have examined and discussed the means which the Royalists had at their command for the furtherance of their cause. It appears from the Clarendon Papers, quoted by Mr. Christie, that overtures were made to him by Charles, to which he made no response. Overtures more significant in their tendency, though less important in their profession, were made to him in 1659 by one more eminent and powerful than Charles. Monk wrote to Cooper begging him to use his influence that no change might be made in the disposal of the men belonging to the Northern army. Similar letters were written to the Speaker and other members of Council; and it is clear that Monk was feeling his way. Another passage quoted by Mr. Christie from the Clarendon State Papers describes the discord of parties which prevailed at this time, and presaged the coming change.

"The confusions now," writes Major Wood, June 3, 1659, "are so great that it is not to be credited; the chaos was a perfection in comparison of our order and government; the parties are like so many floating islands, sometimes joining and appearing like a continent, when the next flood or ebb separates them that it can hardly be known where they will be next."\*

A rising was attempted by Charles's partisans in Cheshire, but was easily suppressed by Lambert. Shortly after this, Cooper was arrested on suspicion of corresponding with the Royalist agents, but was acquitted by the committee which examined him. Meanwhile the generals, apprehending some coup d'état on the part of Parliament, addressed a remonstrance to the House for its lenity to the recent rebels and its ingratitude to those who had punished them. The House was angry and cashiered the generals; in return, the generals were furious and threatened the Parliament. Westminster beheld the troops of Lambert arrayed against the troops of the Parliament, but no collision ensued, and Lambert triumphed without bloodshed. Cooper sided with the Parliament in the Council of State against Lambert. But he soon ceased to sit, and the Council itself could not maintain itself against the Army. A rival Council was set up by the generals, which was soon merged in a Committee of Safety, among the members of which were Fleetwood, Lambert, and Desborough. The special objects of this body were to abolish tithes and prevent a monarchy. But it had neglected to secure the co-operation of Monk, whose attitude was one of armed and expectant inaction. His neutrality prevented the Council from preserving the ascendancy which it had gained. The army differed as much from any body of regular troops which had been

---

\* "Clarendon State Papers, iii. 479."

known, either in England or on the Continent, as it differed from any that has been known since. It was, in its origin and its main composition, not an army of mercenaries. It had mercenaries in its ranks, but its principal constituents were men who had become soldiers not for money, nor for fashion, but for a cause which they deemed as precious as life. They were recruited from the middle ranks of society in an age when the middle ranks possessed the soil of England much more extensively than they do now, and from the religious, thoughtful, and earnest section of those ranks. They were citizens in arms rather than professional soldiers. Yet the object which had banded them together, the success which they had achieved, the victories which they had won, the wonderful revolution which they had effected in the condition of England, all combined to inspire them with a unity of feeling far stronger than the *esprit de corps* on which professional soldiers justly pride themselves. They were the established and recognised representatives of a great and triumphant principle. They had changed the England of the Stuarts into the England of the Commonwealth. They had triumphed over the King and the Prelacy; they had humbled Parliament; they had confronted and cowed their own leader, the great Oliver, when he ventured to aspire to the name and power of king. No wonder that such an army should have become a caste, a proud, sensitive, jealous, and menacing caste. No wonder that its chiefs should be suspicious of any encroachment on its powers, and its officers of any encroachment on its principles. But, notwithstanding all the forces which tended to inspire union, there were other forces which more strongly tended to inspire disunion. The civilians by whom the army was recruited retained many of their civilian predilections. Some remained Presbyterians, while others, hardened and braced by the struggles of a conflict which had been no less theological than martial, were implacable Independents. Again, Monk had little sympathy with Lambert, Fleetwood, and the London generals; Fairfax was decidedly hostile to them; the army of the North had only a partial sympathy with the army of the South. As each section became conscious of this latent disagreement from the other, the suspicion which each harboured towards the other became more confirmed. Such was the state of feeling when, in November, 1659, commissioners from Monk came up to London to treat with Fleetwood, and were afterwards induced to confer with Cooper and Sir A. Haselrig. They left London with the assurance that, if Monk declared for the Parliament, he would be named Generalissimo of all its forces. Before the end of the month Cooper, in conjunction with eight members of the old Council of State, had secured the power and restored the

Parliament, and appointed Monk Commander-in-Chief of the forces in England and Scotland. Cooper was, in the following January elected member of a new Council of State, and at length, in January 1660, obtained his seat for Downton on his old petition of 1640. Shortly after, the Speaker handed to him in the House his commission of colonel of the regiment of horse, of which Fleetwood had been deprived.

The policy which Cooper now followed is thus described in a letter cited by Mr. Christie :—

"The present complexion of the Parliament," writes Mordaunt to Hyde, "is very pale; Sir Arthur Haselrig undermined by Cooper, Morley, and Weaver, and from a Rodomont is reduced to a pitiful rogue. . . . Cooper yet hath his tongue well hung, and words at will, and employs his rhetoric to cashier all officers, civil as well as military, that sided with Fleetwood and Lambert; and Morley rebukes all the sectarics. Thus these two garble the army and state. . . . The parties in the House are diametrically opposite: the three-and-twenty with Cooper, who acts Cicero; and some sixteen with Nevill, who represents Anthony."\*

After Monk came up to London, he was beset by the conflicting intrigues of Cooper and Haselrig. Eventually Cooper triumphed, and Monk proceeded, at his instigation, to Westminster, where he demanded a free Parliament. The Rump were alarmed, not only at the demand, but also at the enthusiasm which it excited. They saw that it was now impossible to retain the supreme power within their own small circle, and proceeded to vote for completing the number of members. But they clogged the vote with qualifications which would have restricted the new members to their own party. This plan was opposed by Monk, who insisted on the readmission of the excluded members. Monk carried his point, and was appointed Commander-in-Chief, and issued to Cooper the commission of Governor of the Isle of Wight.

The Rump Parliament came to an end in April, 1660. A Convention Parliament of the two Houses met on the 25th of that month. By this time Monk had matured his plans in favour of the King. The two Houses had sent commissioners to Charles at Breda; one of the commissioners was Cooper. On the 1st of May, Sir John Grenville appeared in both Houses, and presented the King's letters to the two Speakers. On the 29th of May, Charles himself entered London amid the acclamations of an enthusiastic populace. He had returned without conditions and restrictions, to the dismay of one party, the mixed fear and

---

\* "Clarendon State Papers, iii, 650."



satisfaction of another, but to the unqualified joy of the majority of the English people.

One incident connected with this journey to Breda had lasting consequences to Cooper. While travelling his carriage was upset, and his fall caused an internal abscess, from which he suffered during the rest of his life. Not the least part of the misfortune was that it subjected him to the lampoons of scurrilous assailants, whose foul imagination suggested an origin of the malady as shameful as it was false.

Cooper was now in his thirty-ninth year. He had given, not open and consistent, but seasonable and efficient aid to the Restoration. Nor was the King allowed to remain ignorant of his merits. While Charles halted at Canterbury, on his way to London, he made Cooper a Privy Councillor. The Convention Parliament having been confirmed by statute, Cooper retained his seat in the House of Commons, and supported the Government there. He was one of the thirty-four Special Commissioners appointed, at the close of the Session, to try twenty-eight regicides who had been "excepted for life and estate." Among the accused were Harrison and Hugh Peters; among the judges, Monk and Montague, of whom one had been a general in Cromwell's army and the other a peer in Cromwell's Upper House. Ten of the former were executed at once; the remainder having surrendered in obedience to the Royal Proclamation, were respited till a special Act should be passed for their execution. That Act was never passed, and they escaped the infliction of death.

Mr. Christie is at great pains to defend Cooper from the charge of criminal inconsistency in sitting as a judge on these trials. We think this is superfluous. Cooper lived in an age which was not nicely sensitive as to alternations of political partisanship. Cooper's delicacy was not greater than that of his contemporaries; but it certainly was not less. Monk, Montague, and Manchester sat on the trial of the regicides, and they had all taken an active and avowed part in the events which led to the trial and sentence of Charles I. Cooper was out of Parliament at the time, devoting himself to the business of sessions and assizes, and there are reasons for supposing that he regarded the execution of the King with disapproval. Having given active assistance to the *de facto* government of Cromwell, he undoubtedly would have behaved with greater decency if he had refused to sit as judge on the men who had laid the foundation of that government. But his inconsistency or indecency was far less flagrant than that of his colleagues.

The Convention Parliament having been dissolved, Cooper ceased to sit in the House of Commons. Before the new Par-

liament met, in 1661, he had been created Baron Ashley of Wimborne St. Giles. A few days later he received an appointment which in our age would be impossible, that of Chancellor of the Exchequer and Under-Treasurer. In our day it is inconceivable how a Chancellor of the Exchequer could sit in the House of Lords. But one of two things is clear. Either the office was in those days less financially important than it is now, or its general importance was so great that it was considered expedient to combine its tenure with a seat in the House of Lords. Lord Campbell, however, is wrong in stating that Ashley gave himself to routine business and the life of a *roué*. Without claiming for him the morality of a purist, it is only just to observe that there is no proof that in an age of general laxity Ashley was pre-eminently profligate. That he may have attended the levees of Lady Castlemaine, and have sauntered in the company of other royal mistresses, is not improbable; but in doing this he only showed himself not superior to the general demeanour of the society in which he lived. It was one baleful effect of the tone adopted after the Restoration, not only by the Court, but by many of the people who had groaned under Puritan strictness, that men affected vices from which they were really free. And as a character for gallantry implied the profession of certain showy qualities, of which most men are vain, it is not unlikely that Ashley's vanity gave colour to an imputation which was common to the whole courtly circle in which he moved. As to the other imputation, it is equally unfounded. Ashley did not concentrate on routine duties the time which he is represented to have stolen from frivolity. At this time the debates in the House of Lords were more vehement and more thorough than those in the Commons. The opinions of members of the Upper House commanded a more general attention throughout the country than those of the Lower; and on the important questions then under debate Ashley spoke neither unfrequently nor ineffectively. He opposed the Corporation Act, and the Act of Uniformity, and the Act which imposed on all militia officers the same tests as were contained in the Corporation and Uniformity Acts, except renunciation of the Covenant. He vigorously supported a Bill for enabling the King to dispense with the provisions of the Act of Uniformity. Had this Bill become law, it would have prevented many a bitter conflict in after-times; but it was lost. Of Ashley's speech in its support Clarendon says: "The Lord Ashley adhered firmly to his point, spake often and with great sharpness of wit, and had a cadence in his words and pronunciation that drew attention." This advocacy of the dispensing power won for Ashley the favour of the King, who was naturally inclined to toleration, and, moreover, thought it a matter of

honour to adhere to his Declaration from Breda. "Strange to hear," says old Pepys, "how my Lord Ashley . . . is got into favour so much that, being a man of great business and yet of pleasure and drolling too, he, it is thought, will be made Treasurer on the death or removal of the good old man." The Count de Comminges about this time writes:—

"Lord Ashley, Chancellor of the Exchequer, who was formerly of Cromwell's Council, and who in my opinion is the only man who can be set against Clarendon for talent and firmness, does not shrink from speaking his opinions of Clarendon with freedom, and contradicting him to his face. He has gone so far that he has made the King perceive that Clarendon's alliance with the Duke of York was very prejudicial to him, and as he is very acute and a very good courtier, and is perfectly well in the King's graces, it is suspected with sufficient probability that Lord Bristol and Secretary Bennet and Morrice and all the rest of that clique may well give trouble to the Chancellor, and place him in a disagreeable position."

Both courtiers and foreigners perceived that Clarendon's influence was beginning to wane. And some of them were shrewd enough to see that Ashley's was on the rise.

Pepys writes, June 6, 1663: "Sir John Hebden, the Russia Resident, did tell me how he is vexed to see things at Court ordered as they are by nobody that attends to business, but every man himself or his own pleasures. He cries up my Lord Ashley to be almost the only man that he sees to look after business, and with the ease and mastery that he wonders at him."

His impulsiveness was of such a combative character that every public question was, to his view, coloured rather by its relations to himself and his position than by its eventual bearings on the public weal. Whether in office or in opposition, he was an equally keen advocate both in defence and attack. Thus we find him, on one memorable occasion, defending the King's prerogative even against the King's wish. He had been appointed, after the beginning of the Dutch War, Treasurer of the King's Prizes, which, under the prevailing system of percentages, was probably a very lucrative post. While he held this office Sir George Downing introduced a proviso into the Supply Bill of 1665, limiting the appropriation of a war grant exclusively to expenses of the war. This suggestion was carried, and became the foundation of modern Appropriation Bills. How necessary such a proviso was became evident in the following year, when the Commons examined the public accounts and discovered how much of the money voted for the war had been wasted on other objects. But when it was first introduced it offended none so much as Lord Clarendon, who was Lord Chancellor, and Lord

Ashley, who was Chancellor of the King's Exchequer and Treasurer of the King's Prizes. Clarendon denounced the clause because it encroached on the royal prerogative. Ashley disliked it because he was a financial official at the time, and the clause transferred the disposal of public money from official decision to the domain of statute law. But the King's friends went beyond the King himself. Charles wanted money, and he wanted it with the least possible trouble and delay. He saw that opposition to this clause might make future grants difficult and reluctant. So he bade his friends withhold their opposition, which they did, and then the Bill passed the Lords as it had passed the Commons.

Although Ashley had sided with Clarendon in his zeal for the prerogative, he did not side with him in his propensity to persecution. He strongly opposed the intolerance of the Five Mile Act and the Bill for imposing oaths of absolute obedience. Considering that the plague was at this time ravaging the capital, and that the beneficent ministrations of Dissenting ministers had sensibly mitigated its horrors among the sufferers in London, it is as difficult for us to understand the intolerance of the former Act, as it is to realize the extravagant spirit of loyalty which nearly carried the latter Bill. But the tenor of each measure clearly indicates how galling had been the yoke of that Puritanism which excited so strong a reaction.

In this year Ashley formed the acquaintance of John Locke, an acquaintance which ripened into a friendship honourable to both, although ultimately dangerous to Locke. The foundation of their intimacy was a malady of Ashley, caused by the accident to which we have already referred. Owing to the plague, Parliament had adjourned from London to Oxford, and Ashley was staying there after the prorogation. Locke was a student at Christ Church, and, after a brief diplomatic apprenticeship, studying medicine. Ashley had consulted Dr. Thomas, a resident physician, respecting some waters, and Thomas, unable to attend, had deputed Locke. The connexion thus formed involved Locke in all the perils then attendant on the friends of obnoxious statesmen. Suspected of having written pamphlets under the inspiration of his patron, he shared the disgrace which fell on the latter, and after Ashley's death was punished with exile. For this penalty England has reason to be grateful, for she owes to it the "*Essay on the Human Understanding*."

This was a hard time for England. France and Denmark had allied themselves to Holland against her. The Great Plague had carried terror and death into London. The Great Fire had followed the Great Plague. There were universal complaints of financial mismanagement. Simultaneously a great depreciation had taken place in the value of landed property; rents had gone

down, and land could be bought for sixteen years' purchase. It is curious at this time to find Ashley coming forward as an opponent of the importation of Irish cattle into England, for no better reason than a fear that it would injure English agriculturists !

England was now weary of the war she was waging against Holland, and France was equally weary of her alliance with Holland. A secret treaty was effected between Louis and Charles by the intervention of the Dowager Queen Henrietta Maria, and France discontinued her reluctant and languid hostilities. Holland a little later concluded a war which had been as glorious to herself as it was disgraceful to England.

In the same year Lord Southampton, Lord High Treasurer, died. The Treasury was accordingly put into Commission. Ashley, still Chancellor of the Exchequer, was a Commissioner with Sir W. Coventry, Sir John Duncombe, and Sir T. Clifford as colleagues. In the same year Clarendon was removed from the Chancellorship. Whether Ashley was in any way accessory to his disgrace is not very clear, and certainly is not important. In an age of such changeful and shifty politics, it is difficult to say when statesmen were not opposing or intriguing against each other. It is certain that Ashley opposed the vague and general impeachment of Clarendon for treason without assignment of specific acts ; but it is also certain that he supported the Bill by which Clarendon, after he had fled the country, was banished for life, and was made liable to the punishment of death if he returned to England. There had never been any long or close intimacy between Ashley and Clarendon, and official ties in that age were not regarded as strongly binding. No two men could have been more unlike than Ashley and Clarendon ; the one vain, restless, aspiring, and ambitious ; the other staid, haughty, obstinate, and imperious. The proud and overbearing disposition of Clarendon must have affronted when it did not cow the volatile energy of Ashley. Nor must it be overlooked that certain transactions in Clarendon's life had made it very difficult to defend him from popular obloquy. His connivance at the sale of Dunkirk to France, and his share in riveting the dependence of Charles on the French King's gold, had made him as unpopular with high-principled patriots as his narrow Churchmanship and indomitable bigotry had made him odious with the persecuted and obstinate sectaries.

Ashley was not likely to have much love for Clarendon, nor to grieve over his removal, and although he might hesitate to begin the attack on the Chancellor, he would have less hesitation in pushing him in his descent, when the victim had lost the friendship of the King and the regard of the people. When

Clarendon fled, the influence and power of the Ministry passed into other hands. The age and indolence of Lord Southampton, and subsequently his death, had made Clarendon the real chief minister of the Crown. That authority could not descend on any one person. It was therefore divided among several. He was succeeded by a knot of men, whose term of office was rendered memorable by one constitutional innovation, and infamous by many perfidious intrigues. The Cabal contained the germ of a ministerial cabinet, and therefore the germ of ministerial responsibility. But the members of the cabinet, of whom Ashley was one, unconscious of the want which they were destined to illustrate rather than supply, wove such a complex web of dark and dirty intrigues that the period of their existence is generally regarded as the most disgraceful in the later portion of English history. For the minute record of their intrigues and sub-intrigues we must refer the reader to Mr. Christie's careful narrative. It is only fair, however, to premise that they began their career with a policy which they too flagrantly abandoned afterwards. The power of Spain, which English statesmen had hitherto dreaded, was waning, while that of France, which they had not yet had reason to dread, was rising. The men of the Cabal, by the instrumentality of Temple, formed the Triple Alliance which united England, Sweden, and Holland against the young and ardent ambition of Louis XIV. This was a just and natural alliance. It was the alliance of three nations connected by language, religion, and blood. They were all Protestants, all maritime, and all commercial. It has seldom been the good fortune of diplomacy to affix its seal to an union so distinctly indicated by natural affinities. Yet of the men who were active in forming it, all were in different degrees active in breaking it. And that it could be broken with safety is more discreditable to the good sense than to the good faith of that age. Charles was indifferent to the honour and glory of England. It was more congenial to his tastes to sink into the condition of a paid vassal of France than to assert the position of an English sovereign dependent upon the good-will of an inquiring and investigating House of Commons. It was not wonderful that he should prefer an inglorious alliance with Louis to an independent alliance with a set of Dutch burghers who had learned to govern their country without a king. Still less strange is it that, Roman Catholic as Charles is now known to have been not only in heart but by profession, he should have preferred an alliance with a Catholic to one with a Protestant power. But the odd thing is that the rupture with a Protestant Republic in favour of an union with a Roman Catholic despotism should not have been intolerable to the bulk of a people who

had emancipated themselves from Popery and from tyranny. The explanation is to be found in the general ignorance of economical subjects which then prevailed. The Dutch might be good Republicans and good Protestants, but they were also traders; they were therefore our rivals, and as rivals they must be put down. Their commerce was supposed to injure ours, and therefore must be destroyed. It was this unworthy sentiment which allowed Charles to do with little danger an act at once impolitic and ignominious. He entered in June, 1670, into a secret treaty with Louis to introduce Popery into England, and to receive aid from Louis in case of opposition; to make war conjointly with Louis against Holland. Charles was to furnish the bulk of the ships, and Louis was to pay Charles three million francs annually as long as the war lasted. But this treaty was not known to all the members of the Cabal. Only Arlington and Clifford were privy to it. To hoodwink the other members a second treaty was set on foot, in negotiating which Lauderdale and Buckingham were engaged, and the terms of which were to be made known, as they were in a third treaty dated fourteen months later, and intended to mislead the world as to the duration of the mutual understanding between the two Kings. This last treaty was signed by all the members of the Cabal, including Ashley, who, as Mr. Christie points out, seems to have been quite unaware of the provisions of the first, which guaranteed the establishment of Popery in England. The whole intrigue was full of fraud, falsehood, and double-dealing. Louis decoyed Charles; Charles fenced with Louis. Two of the Cabal cheated the other three, and the whole gang cheated the country into an alliance fatal to its honour and interests. Ashley is free from the guilt of having knowingly assisted Charles in his scheme to force Popery on England, but he cannot be acquitted of having connived at an arrangement by which a King of England was to receive money for subordinating England to France in a joint attack on the liberties of the Dutch Republic. If it cannot be truly said of him that singly "The triple band he broke," it is still true that he helped to break it, and thus to forward the designs of Catholic and despotic powers.

Neither does it seem easy to acquit him of complicity in another affair, which caused just scandal at the time. War was proclaimed against the Dutch in March, 1672, while Parliament was not sitting. The secret treaty with Louis secured Charles a certain subsidy, but wholly insufficient for so great an undertaking. The obvious course was to convoke Parliament, but this was a course repugnant to the King. Instead of convoking, he prorogued it to a still more distant date. This measure did not facilitate the acquisition of the money which he required.

He therefore resorted to a strange and arbitrary act in order to supply his wants. He shut up the Exchequer, at the cost of a bankruptcy almost wide enough to be called national. It is quite true that Clifford advised, and that Ashley remonstrated against this most flagrant breach of faith. And this Mr. Christie seems to think is sufficient to absolve his hero from all share in blame in the proceeding. We are of an entirely different opinion. We do not think that the penning of a simple memorandum (which he probably knew would be disregarded by the King) was all that was required from a Minister who was not only a Privy Councillor, but also a Commissioner of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer, which was to be made an instrument of robbery. Ashley retained his office and was shortly afterwards advanced in the Peerage. So far as we can ascertain he never, as minister, made any attempt to cure the injustice which had been committed, and which was never wholly redressed. Mr. Christie quotes Stringer's memoirs to show that Charles wished to confer on him the post of Lord High Treasurer, but that Ashley resorted to a multiplicity of devices to elude the honour. The motive of this reluctance, it is urged, was disapproval of the arbitrary injustice perpetrated by the King. To us it rather seems that the unpopularity of that act was sufficient to deter a man of less sensitiveness and less shrewdness than Ashley from undertaking the chief control of the national finances. The King certainly wished both to reward him and attach him more closely to his interests. For Ashley had been useful to him in furthering the Dutch war and the French alliance; he had again been useful to him in supporting the Declaration of Indulgence, by which the King dispensed with the penal provisions of existing statutes against Dissenters, and gave them immunities which it would have been wise and politic to perpetuate. In both these cases Ashley followed the bent of his convictions, or whatever feeling passed with him for conviction. He shared the ordinary jealousy which was then generally entertained by the English towards the Dutch; he shared with many of his countrymen their prepossessions in favour of the French. He had himself been a Presbyterian and had acted with Presbyterians. He was therefore in favour of their liberal and tolerant treatment. In each case his own conviction or caprice jumped with the policy of the King, who created him Earl of Shaftesbury, and was disposed to make him Lord Treasurer. On Shaftesbury declining this honour, the King conferred on him the most exalted dignity in the realm. The Great Seal was taken from the keeper, Sir Orlando Bridgman, and given to Shaftesbury with the higher office of Chancellor. Upon this Clifford, now a peer, became Lord Treasurer, to the



disappointment of Arlington, who, having been Charles's confederate in the secret French treaty, reckoned on the King's grateful recollection of his services. Charles probably thought that Clifford's counsel in the Exchequer business merited acknowledgment, and on this account preferred him to Arlington, whom he pronounced to be too young.

Shaftesbury as Chancellor had to address the Parliament which met in February, 1673, after an interval of two years, and one year after the beginning of the war. It was then usual for the Lord Chancellor to expand and supplement the Speech with which the King had opened the Session. On this occasion the King asked for supplies to carry on the war against the Dutch; a war which he described as "important, necessary, and expensive." He also expressed his pride in the Declaration of Indulgence and his resolution to stick by it. The speech of the Chancellor followed, expanding that of the King and commenting on it, paragraph by paragraph. It called the Dutch the enemies of every monarchy, and the rivals of England in trade. "You judged right," it said, "that at any rate *delenda est Carthago*, and therefore the King may well say to you, 'Tis your war.'" When he referred to the King's debts, the Chancellor had the intrepidity to aver that the "stop of the Exchequer" was forced on the King much against his will by the insufficiency of former supplies. And he dwelt upon the mildness and toleration of the King as evinced in his Declaration of Indulgence. The whole of his speech was in a tone of florid exultation. If it expressed his real sentiments, they were singularly transitory and evanescent. If they were not his real sentiments, he must be held guilty of a most unworthy and unpardonable simulation. Probably the truth lay between the two hypotheses. Shaftesbury agreed officially with the tenor of the King's speech, but his agreement was not the effect of deep reflection, nor the source of profound emotion. With his easy lightness of heart, he lavished upon its embellishment the ready resources of his rhetorical skill, and he knew himself so little that he entirely overlooked the prospect of having on some future day to recant the professions in which he had then so liberally indulged. But though this ready adaptation of language to the exigencies of a position does not argue a deep depravity, it strongly militates against the supposition that Shaftesbury had firm and fixed principles.

In the meantime the English people were undergoing one of those periodical accessions of anti-Catholic feeling which recur at intervals in our later history, and which it would be inconsiderate to denounce as the results of reckless bigotry. Although neither the conversion of Charles nor his treaty with Louis were

known to the world, yet his brother's conversion and the Roman Catholic sympathies of the Court were no secret, and the people began to look with suspicion on any apparent connivance at the obnoxious religion. It is probable enough that Charles's Indulgence was not only intended to comprehend both Roman Catholics and Protestant Dissenters, but was issued with the object of recommending liberality to the Catholics under guise of toleration of the Dissenters. Nothing could be more unpopular than the Declaration was. Its intention was liberal enough to shock all who were bigots; its manner was arbitrary enough to shock all who were tolerant. As Lord Macaulay puts it, "All the enemies of religious freedom and all the friends of civil freedom found themselves on the same side." Those who cared little for Papists or for Puritans viewed with alarm this new exercise of the Prerogative, and the King's Manifesto aroused at once the political and religious fears of the nation. The Commons promised the sum required for carrying on the War. But after they had promised this, they voted an Address to the King, in which they maintained that "penal Statutes in matters ecclesiastical cannot be suspended but by Act of Parliament." The King cautiously replied, that he would consider it. The controversy continued until the King appealed to the Lords, who answered equivocally. Then the King rejoined, in language which sounds oddly at the present day, "I take this Address of yours," he said, "very kindly, and will always be very affectionate to you, and I expect that you shall stand by me, as I will always by you." The Lords did not respond to the King's wish that they should act as a buffer between His Majesty and the Commons. On the contrary, they concurred in a joint Address with the Commons against the increase of Popish recusants in the kingdom. They joined in asking for the expulsion of all foreign priests and Jesuits, and for the imposition of a Protestant test on all officers of the Army. Next, the Lords began to prepare a separate address against the Declaration of Indulgence. The King did not wait for its delivery. He anticipated it by cancelling his Declaration within five weeks from the day on which he had expressed his firm resolution to "stick by it." He did not inform the Lords himself of this change, but left it to be told by Shaftesbury, who, five weeks ago, had eloquently described its publication as evidence of the King's goodness and kindness of heart. Mr. Christie quotes a paper found at St. Giles's, recommending a reference of the question by the King to the House of Peers, as Shaftesbury's. We are by no means sure that it is by Shaftesbury. If he was the author, it is only another proof of the singular versatility of his opinions; for he had not only approved, as Chancellor, of the

[Vol. XCVII. No. CXCI.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. XLI. No. I. H

King's conduct in cancelling the Declaration, but he also expressed his approval of it with his usual effusiveness in the House of Lords. The Opposition, still flushed with this victory over the King, soon obtained another by carrying the famous Test Bill, which compelled the Duke of York and Clifford to resign their employments, but not before it had secured for the King the subsidy promised by the Commons in the early part of the Session.

Parliament was now prorogued. Osborne, created first Lord Latimer and afterwards Earl of Danby, had succeeded Clifford. Two parties were contending for supremacy in the nation. One supported Popery and the French alliance, the other, and the more powerful, was opposed to both. General opinion regarded Shaftesbury as a leader of the latter party; and he is said to have armed his household against the apprehended attacks of Popish malignants. That the King suspected Shaftesbury of being at the head of the Protestant party is not unlikely. If he did, the conduct of the faction in the House of Commons was not likely to reconcile His Majesty to it or its leaders, for when the two Houses met after their third prorogation, the Commons voted an address, deprecating the consummation of the intended marriage between the Duke of York and the Duchess of Modena, which had already been celebrated by proxy. They further begged that his Royal Highness might not be married "to any person but of the Protestant religion." The address was unavailing. Again the Houses were prorogued for a short time, and on their assembling again, the King's speech was followed by the usual supplementary speech of the Chancellor. This Parliament also was prorogued within less than a week, from the 3rd of November to 7th of January. In the meantime the House of Commons had made itself sufficiently disagreeable to Charles. It had given expression to the popular feeling against the Popish sympathies and the arbitrary tendencies of the Court. It had repeated its remonstrance against the marriage of the Duke of York, and preferred new complaints against the army, and against the administration of the Duke of Lauderdale. It had refused supplies, and also refused to recognise the Dutch war. No wonder that the King was irritated at so impracticable and unaccommodating an assembly, and less wonder that he should be displeased with a Minister who had, latterly, exhibited sympathy with the constitutional opinions of the opposition. Within six days after the prorogation of Parliament, Shaftesbury was deprived of the Great Seal.

"His brother-in-law, Henry Coventry, was the unwilling bearer of the following order to Shaftesbury to deliver up the great seal:

“CHARLES R.

“Our will and pleasure is that you forthwith deliver our great seal to our right trusty and well-beloved Councillor Henry Coventry, our principal Secretary of State, and for so doing this shall be your warrant. Given at our Court at Whitehall the ninth day of November, 1673, in the five-and-twentieth year of our reign.

“By His Majesty’s command,

“ARLINGTON.

“To our right trusty and right well-beloved Cousin  
and Councillor, Anthony, Earl of Shaftesbury,  
our High Chancellor of England.’”

“It is said by Stringer that Coventry, as he took the seal, addressed Shaftesbury in these words: ‘My Lord, you are happy; you are out of danger, and all safe; but we shall all be ruined and undone; I desired to be excused from this office, but, being your relation and friend, they put it as an affront on me.’”

After Shaftesbury’s dismissal, the Cabal Ministry soon came to an end.

Of the manner in which he discharged his judicial duties during the year he held the Great Seal there is little to be said, but that little is not unfavourable. Shaftesbury was not a professional lawyer,—he had no knowledge of the technicalities of law, and it was impossible that with such a disqualification he should have left any enduring impression on the administration of equity. But he seems to have been an honest judge, and to have relied on the knowledge of capable assessors in framing the decisions of his court. It is less probable that Dryden wrote under the inspiration of accepted or expected favours than that he echoed a sound opinion when he penned the panegyric in the second edition of his “Absalom and Achitophel.”

But if Dryden’s praise is hyperbolic, Lord Campbell’s condemnation is extravagant. The main charge which he urges against Shaftesbury is that of shuffling in the matter of the injunctions applied for to restrain the clients of the bankers from proceeding at law against them on account of the injury inflicted by the “stop of the Exchequer.” But this charge is, we think, fully met by Mr. Christie, as are the ill-natured sneers on Shaftesbury’s dressing, riding, and coxcombry which Lord Campbell borrowed from Roger North, and perverted in the borrowing.

It was not likely that a nature like Shaftesbury’s should rust in idleness when emancipated from the cares of office. Whether it was a fear of the mischief he might do in opposition, or a sense of the service he might render in the Ministry, one feeling or the other seems to have induced Charles to try to bring him back again. But Shaftesbury was obdurate. Mr. Christie quotes, without seeing the construction which is suggested by quoting,

the simultaneous efforts of the French envoy, Ruvigny, to bribe him into resuming office. It is true the bribe was rejected, but the fact that it was offered and not rejected with the most open and scornful indignation, shows that Shaftesbury's abilities were more respected than his principles by contemporary politicians. Henceforth Shaftesbury's active mind was devoted to the cause of opposition. Whether, in the capacity of a popular leader, he was animated exclusively by a pure spirit of patriotism, as Mr. Christie asserts, or by spite, vindictiveness, and natural turbulence, is a question which it is, perhaps, now impossible to solve. But whatever be the true solution, it is unquestionable that, during the four following years, he was the most conspicuous politician in England.

Parliament met again in January, 1674. It was barely a year since Shaftesbury, as Chancellor, had descanted on the mildness and toleration of the King in issuing the Declaration of Indulgence. He now came forward, as a leader of the opposition, to propose an address, which was carried, to order all Papists to repair to their dwellings or depart ten miles from the capital. The whole speech was conceived in the spirit of Protestant terror, and must have incensed the King, the Duke of York, and the Court. Next were heard the first mutterings of the future Exclusion Bill. It was proposed that any of the Royal family who married a Roman Catholic should be debarred from the succession. Lord Peterborough declared this to be a "horrid proposal." Shaftesbury replied, "not so horrid." The prosecution of this and other measures was stopped by one of those prorogations, which, in Charles's reign, followed close on every meeting of Parliament. Parliament was prorogued the last week of February. By this time the Dutch War had become highly unpopular, and a separate peace was made with Holland.

The conduct of Shaftesbury in the last Session soon brought its natural fruits. His name was erased from the list of the Privy Council in the following May; and he became more and more identified with the opposition. In this attitude he was now joined by Buckingham, who had been dismissed from the Ministry on an address from the Commons. Arlington had subsided from the post of a Secretary of State into that of Lord Chamberlain; and the two ministers against whom Buckingham and Shaftesbury combined to wage war were Danby and Lauderdale. Danby was, as Macaulay states, corrupt himself and a corrupter of others. He was one of the statesmen who helped to build up that system of Parliamentary corruption which the succeeding century admired in all the luxuriance of its composite development. He was a staunch champion of the King's prerogative. But he was an Englishman, and had many hearty

English sentiments. He loathed the idea of maintaining the King's prerogative by foreign arms, and believed that its most solid and substantial support might be found in the array of the Cavaliers, the Clergy, the Universities—in short, the Conservative forces of the kingdom. Therefore, in prosecution of his scheme, he did not fear to confront both the Papists and the Dissenters. He introduced a Test Act, which, in fact, imposed upon all military and civil officers and all members of Parliament an oath of passive obedience. The debate on this Bill was singularly vehement and protracted. It was debated five days before going into Committee, it was debated seventeen days in and out of Committee. The divisions and protests which it caused kept the whole country in a state of excitement for weeks. Shaftesbury took a prominent part in opposing the Bill. Burnet says of him, that "he distinguished himself more in this Session than ever he had done before." He adds also, that bold as Shaftesbury was in his criticism, his caution was equal to his boldness. He gave no excuse for the Crown to send him to the Tower. The testimony of Andrew Marvell is worth quoting. "It might be injurious," says he, "where all of them did so excellently well, to attribute more to any one of those Lords than another, unless, because the Duke of Lauderdale and the Earl of Shaftesbury have been the more reproached for this brave action, it be requisite by a double proportion of praise to set them two on equal terms with the rest of their companions in honour." The Bill had passed the second reading triumphantly, but never got beyond this. While these keen debates were proceeding, its course was arrested by a keener discussion of privilege between the two Houses, a discussion which Shaftesbury has the merit of having inflamed into a quarrel. Having used his influence to excite the Commons into a passionate remonstrance against the right of the Lords to hear appeals in Equity, he fanned the flame by stimulating the Lords to an equally passionate assertion of their right. The Test Bill was forgotten in the quarrel, and the quarrel was closed by a prorogation. Nothing could have been cleverer than Shaftesbury's tactics in this Session, and they were equally brilliant in the next. His monition to the Lords not to part with their appellate jurisdiction was one of the best specimens of *ad hominem* rhetoric upon record. He actually succeeded in gaining over the Duke of York and the Romanist Peers to his side, and finally the question was lulled by the prorogation of Parliament for the long period of fifteen months. This prorogation came to an end in February 1667. The position of the King was at this time very strange, and as discreditable as it was strange. He was the acknowledged mediator between France and Holland. He was

at the same time the unacknowledged pensionary of France. He had a secret compact with Louis. The conditions of this compact were to keep his Parliament from meeting as long as possible, and to make no treaty with any foreign state without the privy of Louis. The French King had given him 100,000*l.* the year before in consideration of this long prorogation, and was now prepared to give him 100,000*l.* more if he would only prorogue for another year. But Charles owed a million sterling, and only a Parliament could give him that large sum. Danby, who hated the French alliance, urged him to take the course which was at once English and constitutional. The King had no alternative but to assent. But previous to the reassembling of Parliament, a French emissary was in London, with French gold, prepared, under the direction of the Duke of York, to play off the passions, whims, and interests of the Nonconformists and the opposition against the minister, whose hostility to France and French ambition was well-known. As soon as the Houses met, Buckingham took the initiative of opposition by moving the question whether the recent prorogation for more than a year had not been illegal, and whether the Parliament was not absolutely dissolved. Shaftesbury seconded Buckingham — as Marvell says, “with extraordinary vigour.” The question was a very nice one, and was most ably argued. The debate became very stormy. After the motion was rejected, it was moved to call these two Peers and two of their supporters to account. Eventually the four were committed to the Tower during the pleasure of the King and of the House. Burnet says, that Lords Salisbury and Shaftesbury gave great offence by asking to have their own cooks with them. Shaftesbury remained in the Tower for a twelvemonth. After that time he sued out a writ of habeas corpus before the Court of King’s Bench, and there he argued the illegality of his commitment. The Court held that it had no jurisdiction in the case, and Shaftesbury was sent back to the Tower, where his imprisonment was now stricter than before.

Meanwhile the relations between Charles and his subjects had become somewhat embarrassing. Louis XIV. had entered on that career of conquest and glory to which we may trace the imitative aggressions of the First, and the retributive humiliations of the Second Empire. He had taken Valenciennes, Cambrai, and St. Omer. His brother of Orleans had defeated the Prince of Orange at the head of 40,000 men. Charles looked on these triumphs of his friend and ally with a satisfaction equal only to the pain and regret which they inspired in his chief minister and the bulk of his people. The latter saw in the conquests of Louis a career preliminary to the suppression of English liberty,

while the former recognised in them the possible instrument for repressing popular discontent and dispensing with refractory Parliaments. The Commons implored the King to form such alliances as might check the ambitious designs of the French monarch, and they promised him adequate supplies for the object. Charles temporized and equivocated. He wanted money and did not want to make war on France; they desired an alliance with Spain and the Empire. After some time they distinctly specified the alliance which they wished him to form. This was too much for Charles, who reproved them, as Elizabeth reproved her Parliaments, for travelling beyond their proper sphere of duty. He then adjourned them, and began a wretched haggle with Louis for money, which ended in a way satisfactory to neither. Mr. Christie taunts Danby with his part in this mercenary squabble. It was a mean part, doubtless, for a minister to play. But Danby probably regarded it as a game of skill played against the art of French diplomacy. He certainly had no intention of giving anything important in exchange for the gold of Louis, and may have piqued himself on obtaining money from the French King without consideration. He soon gave the strongest proof that he himself was not a tool in French hands or an instrument of French ambition. For he helped to bring about the marriage between the Princess Mary and the Prince of Orange, a marriage which was destined to introduce a policy the most fatal to the glory of the French arms and the aggrandizement of French power. This union, fraught with the most important consequences to England and Europe, was celebrated in November, 1678, while Shaftesbury still lay in the Tower.

From his prison Shaftesbury addressed certain supplicatory letters, which testify how much more keenly he felt the severity of his punishment than the duty of self-respect. One of these is written to the King and is remarkable for the recapitulation which it contains of the writer's services to His Majesty at the time of the Restoration. But these letters produced no immediate effect. A petition on his behalf to the House of Lords was rejected on the ground that he had committed a breach of privilege in suing out a writ of habeas corpus in the King's Bench. At last a hearing was granted him, and he made a most humble apology in a speech to the House. Among other things he said—

“I do profess to your Lordships, upon my honour, that I would have perished, rather than have brought my *habeas corpus*, had I then apprehended or been informed that it had been a breach of the privilege of this honourable House. It is my duty, it is my interest, to support your privileges. I shall never oppose them. My Lords, I do



fully acquiesce in the resolution and declaration of this honourable House: I go not about to justify myself, but cast myself at your Lordships' feet; acknowledge my error, and humbly beg your pardon, not only for having brought my *habeas corpus*, but for all other my words and actions, that were in pursuance thereof and proceeding from the same error and mistake.'

"After this, Shaftesbury made submission in the following words, prescribed by the House:—'I do acknowledge that my endeavouring to maintain that the Parliament is dissolved was an ill-advised action, for which I humbly beg the pardon of the King's Majesty and of this most honourable House; and I do also acknowledge that my bringing of a *habeas corpus* in the King's Bench during this session was a high violation of your Lordships' privileges, and a great aggravation of my former offence, for which I likewise most humbly beg pardon of this most honourable House.'"

But this was not all. He made submission of the most complete kind in a form prescribed by the House. Of this it must have galled him to think in after days; and he took the best means to prevent the perpetuation of the ignoble record; for two years later he succeeded in obtaining its erasure from the journals of the House of Lords. When he resumed his seat, those wretched intrigues were still in progress by which Louis, Charles, and the English Opposition were severally trying to overreach each other, and which resulted in the Peace of Nimeguen. Shaftesbury does not appear to have spoken, although he wrote a memorandum on that peace. But a short interval saw him re-assert his usual prominence in the stormy drama of the Popish Plot. Both Houses had appointed Committees to enquire into Sir Edmundbury Godfrey's murder. Both Houses had resolved that "there hath been and still is a damnable and hellish plot, contrived and carried on by the Popish recusants for the assassinating and murdering the King and for subverting the Government and rooting out and destroying the Protestant religion." In deference to the expressed wish of the House of Commons the Duke of York had withdrawn from the Council. Then the Commons sent up a Bill disabling all Roman Catholics (save the Duke of York) from sitting in Parliament; for which Shaftesbury spoke, and which was passed by the Lords. Shaftesbury soon afterwards signed a protest against the refusal of the Lords to join in an address of the Commons for the removal of the Queen and her retinue. In every proceeding on the alarmist side Shaftesbury took a leading part. While the inquiries into the Plot were still in progress, a new direction was given to popular passion by the impeachment of Danby. The chief minister had, by Charles's written order, trafficked with the French King for advance of money to his own sovereign. The dependence of Charles upon the bounty of Louis had been gene-

rally suspected and talked of for some time, but no one could adduce positive proofs of the venal compact or its conditions. Wounded vanity burning to wound again, revealed the nature of negotiations which the two principal parties were equally anxious to keep secret. Montague, the ambassador in Paris, had been disappointed in his object of becoming Secretary of State, and determined to avenge this slight on Danby. Having entered Parliament, he informed the House that he held in his possession papers of the utmost moment to the King and the nation. The House appointed a committee, ordered a search, and found two letters from Danby to Montague, instructing him how to barter proposals of peace for French gold. An impeachment was voted, but before the articles of impeachment could be sent to Danby Parliament was dissolved, having sat eighteen years. The next Session the two Houses were engrossed with the Popish Plot and the prosecution of Danby. The minister, despite Charles's efforts to save him, was sent to the Tower, and Shaftesbury, as leader of the opposition, made a powerful speech on the state of the nation. His next appearance was in a novel and unexpected character. Charles, who felt Danby's loss, had been induced by Sir W. Temple to reconstitute the government, and to appoint a new Council of thirty, composed equally of ministers and independent members of the Legislature, in addition to princes of the blood. It must have been to the astonishment of all, as it was to the disgust of Temple himself, that the man selected to preside over the Council was Shaftesbury, with a salary of 4000*l.* a year, and rank next to that of the Lord Chancellor. It is supposed that the Duchess of Portsmouth and the French Envoy had some influence in suggesting the appointment. In this position he gained the ear of the people by his zealous advocacy of a Protestant succession. The time was when the King had entertained such kindly feelings towards his bastard son Monmouth that the recognition of his legitimacy would not have surprised anybody, and would have particularly pleased that vast section of the people which had a profound horror of Popery. But that time was past. The King had disavowed any intention of recognising the son of Lucy Waters as his heir. It was much to be feared, therefore, that if Charles died, he would be succeeded by the Duke of York. Now the Duke of York was identified by the English people with the cause of Popery. Shaftesbury worked on the popular prejudice, if he did not share it. Exerting a peculiar influence over the House of Commons which no peer could hope to exercise in our day, he caused his willing partisans in the Lower House to introduce and carry the celebrated Exclusion Bill. But this Bill, when it was sent up to the Upper House was signally defeated, although

Shaftesbury gave it his most strenuous support. Its principal effect was to make the King prorogue Parliament without consulting the new Council, by whose advice he had so lately promised to be guided in all weighty affairs. But before he thus prorogued it, he gave assent to a bill more important than any other that was passed during his reign, and the introduction of which immortalizes the name of Shaftesbury. Its author's experience in the King's Bench had taught him how imperfect was the relief given by a writ of habeas corpus under the common law. He therefore introduced a bill remedying the abuses and supplying the deficiencies which often nullified the writ. Although he was President of the King's Council at the time, he had to encounter the strong hostility of the Court in carrying it through the House. There seems, too, some justification of the common story that, after all, it was carried by a combination of blunder and falsehood, if not by a falsehood alone. Bishop Burnet gives this account :—

“Lords Grey and Norris were named to be tellers. Lord Norris, being a man subject to vapours, was not at all times attentive to what he was doing. So, a very fat Lord coming in, Lord Grey counted him for ten, as a jest at first, but, seeing Lord Norris had not observed it, he went on with his misreckoning of ten, so it was reported to the House, and declared that they who were for the Bill were the majority, though, indeed, it went on the other side.”

Mr. Christie says, that an entry in a MS. journal of the Lords shows the numbers in the division to have been 57 and 55, in all 112, while the journals record the presence of only 107 members on that day. Whatever the means that were used, the result has certainly been a happy one for the personal liberty of every subject. If it was filched by an accident, the accident was providential; if by fraud, the fraud deserves the epithet of “pious.” And no Englishman, whether he admires or dislikes the general character of Shaftesbury, can fail to be grateful for an Act which placed the security of himself and his countrymen for ever beyond the assaults of power, the intrigues of corruption, and the concessions of fear.

Shaftesbury had now made himself doubly objectionable to the Court. He had hounded on the persecution of the Duke of York; he had carried an Act which cut away one of the most ordinary supports of despotic power; he had a large following in the City, where he lived, and was regarded as the leader of the Protestant party. It was intolerable that a man should preside at the King's Council, and direct the counsels of the King's enemies. No sooner had a new Parliament been elected, than it was prorogued by the King, who depended on France for sup-

plies, and who took an early opportunity to dismiss Shaftesbury from his office. Yet within a month from the date of this dismissal Sunderland was endeavouring, on the part of the Crown, to persuade him to resume office as First Commissioner of the Treasury. This offer seemed as strange to some of Shaftesbury's contemporaries as it seems to us ; and probably his refusal was regarded as equally strange. But Shaftesbury may have looked forward to Monmouth's succession and his own exaltation as chief minister of the Crown. In the agitation of the Exclusion debates it must often have seemed possible that Monmouth might rally the Protestants of England to his standard, and his succession to the throne on the death of Charles would have been almost certain. In such a contingency Shaftesbury would have been the most powerful man in the kingdom. As it was, he threw in his lot with the Protestants and the Exclusionists, with no very remote probability of securing victory for his followers. He memorialized the King to call a Parliament. But the King, worried by the agitation against the Duke of York, and by the inattention of Louis to his entreaties for aid, still further prorogued it. The King then summoned the Duke of York from Scotland. On this, Shaftesbury succeeded in withdrawing four of his friends from the Privy Council. A few months later, he, with a powerful body of followers, took the bold and unusual step of presenting an indictment in the King's Bench against the Duke of York as a Popish recusant. The summary discharge of the Grand Jury prevented any further action on the indictment, but the popular sentiment, of which Shaftesbury had made himself the exponent, was so strong, that shortly after the Duke sulkily went into exile at the request of the King. At last the long-deferred Parliament met in October, 1680. On November 2nd two strong resolutions of the last Parliament were renewed in the Commons denouncing the intentions of the Papists, and the Duke of York as the hope of the Papists. Next the Exclusion Bill was reintroduced, and passed the Commons. It then went up to the Lords, where it was vigorously supported by Shaftesbury, as vigorously assailed by his nephew, Halifax, and finally rejected. The hostility of Halifax and others is explained by the division that had been widening in the Protestant party. A certain section, under Shaftesbury, regarded Monmouth as their future chief and prince ; another, and that a growing one, looked to William of Orange as the future head of Protestantism and the kingdom. Baffled, Shaftesbury was not discouraged from making another effort. He next had the audacity to move to set aside the King's marriage and marry him to a Protestant. In urging this proposal he had the effrontery to assert that Clarendon had selected the Infanta to be Charles's wife, because he knew that

she was barren and that his own daughter's children must succeed to the throne. It was during this debate that the following scene occurred, which, better than any long description, gives us an idea of the strong dissimilarity which separates our age from that:—

“Some Lord represented that the remedy of divorce was very uncertain, there being no assurance that the King of Great Britain would have children by another wife. Thereupon Lord Shaftesbury rose, and pointing to the King, who is almost always by the chimney, said, ‘Can any one doubt, if he looks at the King’s face, as to his being capable of making children? He is only fifty. I know people upwards of sixty who would have no difficulty in making children.’ The whole House laughed, and the King did the same.

“Lord Clarendon furnished also matter for much laughter, by saying, in order to combat the allegation of the Queen’s barrenness, that he knew her to be like other women, that she had been pregnant, and had had a premature confinement of a child which was larger than a rabbit. The King of England said laughingly to those near him, ‘I do not feel altogether pleased at Lord Clarendon’s knowing so much about all my wife’s concerns.’”

The Peers passed a variety of strong resolutions against the Duke of York and a Popish successor; but Shaftesbury did not proceed with his motion for dissolving the King’s marriage. The Queen herself was a gainer rather than a loser by his proposal, for it elicited in her behalf a degree of consideration and tenderness on the part of Charles to which the poor Portuguese Infanta had long been unaccustomed. But, although he allowed this question to drop, Shaftesbury did not abate his vehemence in attacking the Duke and the Popish succession. One of his speeches, having been printed and published, was thought to be so violent that the Lords ordered it to be burned by the common hangman. The Protestant sympathy or the dread of Popery was gaining strength daily. The Commons refused supplies unless the King would consent to the exclusion of the Duke of York; and while they were in the act of passing a series of strong resolutions, the Black Rod knocked at the door to announce that the King was waiting to prorogue them. The Parliament was prorogued only to be dissolved; and a new Parliament was summoned to meet at Oxford. This selection of any but the capital for the great council of the nation was generally unpopular, and was supposed to intimate the King’s dread of the citizens of London. The King was petitioned to change the summons to Westminster; but in reply to this, as to many other petitions about this time, he gave a firm denial. The Lords and Commons had to provide lodgings themselves, and Shaftesbury was lodged in Balliol College. The two Houses met on March 21st,

1681. The Commons again introduced the Exclusion Bill; and on March the 31st the King, having kept his intention a secret, went down and dissolved the Parliament. This was the last Parliament that sat in Charles's reign. He lived for years after its dissolution: but the provident bounty of Louis made him independent of all grants from Parliament during the remainder of his life. During the Session at Oxford a scene occurred which, as recorded by Barillon, illustrates the anxiety felt by Charles on the question of the succession, and the peculiar relations existing between Shaftesbury and the King, no less than the important position of the former.

"SIRE,—The King of England being two days ago in the Upper House before the Lords had taken their places, Lord Shaftesbury approached and handed him, through the Marquis of Worcester, a paper, which he said had been addressed to him anonymously. This letter says that the only remedy for the disorders which threaten England is to do henceforth what his Britannic Majesty promises in his speech to accept as to the expedients for placing the administration of government in Protestant hands in the case of a Papist coming to the Crown; and that for that purpose the Duke of Monmouth must be declared successor, and a measure which can settle matters in a day must not be postponed.

"The King of England read the paper, and afterwards said to Lord Shaftesbury that he would be very glad to have a legitimate son, and be able in honour and conscience to see a child of his own capable of succeeding him rather than his brother and his brother's children; but that no consideration would induce him to take resolutions contrary to all law and justice, and that means must be sought for satisfying the people other than measures so unjust and odious.

"Lord Shaftesbury replied: 'If you are restrained only by law and justice, place your reliance on us and leave us to act. The laws will be on our side, and we will make laws which will give legality to a thing so necessary for the quiet of the whole nation, and by which great calamities will be avoided.'

"The King of England rejoined: 'My Lord, let there be no self-delusion. I will never yield, and will not let myself be intimidated. Men become ordinarily more timid as they grow old: as for me, I shall be, on the contrary, bolder and firmer, and I will not stain my life and reputation in the little time that perhaps remains for me to live. I do not fear the dangers and calamities which people try to frighten me with. I have the law and reason on my side. Good men will be with me. There is the Church (pointing to the Bishops) which will remain united with me. Believe me, my Lord, we shall not be divided, and I hope that shortly there will be none but poor creatures and knaves to support a measure without any good foundation.'

"This speech was heard with great attention by many. The Duke of Monmouth was near enough to hear it, and he was talking in a low tone, as if in ridicule of the proposal of the letter presented by Lord Shaftesbury."

It is probable that this scene led directly to the impeachment of Shaftesbury. The King would naturally infer from the words of the great Opposition Peer that the project of securing the succession for Monmouth had been weighed and resolved on by him and his followers. Coupling what he had said privately to the King with his indiscreet outbursts of Protestant zeal and his pertinacious prosecution of the Exclusion Bill, Charles would imagine there could be little difficulty in finding proofs sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of treason against the most able and ardent of the anti-Catholic faction. It was clear that in the existing temper of the nation, a man like Shaftesbury would not allow the Court and the Duke of York any rest. The King might abstain from calling Parliament together. Shaftesbury would harangue the Aldermen, the Common Council, and the City mob, until the shouts of his applauding audience reached the King at Windsor. He would publish his speeches, write pamphlets, circulate "Letters from a Person of Quality," use, in fact, every form of assault and annoyance compatible with the restrictions of the Press, the severity of the law, and the bias of the judges. London was a great power in the State then, and Lord Shaftesbury was a great power in London. It would be dangerous to leave such a man unmuzzled; so the Government determined to muzzle him. On the 2nd of July he was seized at his residence, Thanet House, Aldersgate Street, under a warrant from the Privy Council, and carried to Whitehall, where he was examined in the presence of the King, who had come up on purpose. The Council committed him to the Tower on a charge of high treason in conspiring for the death of the King and subversion of the government. Great efforts were made to procure both oral and documentary evidence to substantiate the charge. While the Ministry was ransacking his papers and hunting up witnesses, Shaftesbury petitioned the Judges sitting at the Old Bailey Sessions, to be either tried or discharged. The Chief Justice refused his application, alleging that the Tower was not within the jurisdiction of their commission. Shaftesbury then preferred bills of indictment against the committing magistrate, for subornation of perjury. Meanwhile, a humble friend and follower of his, named College, was indicted in London for treasonable words uttered at Oxford. The Grand Jury having ignored the Bill for this treason, College was seized again, taken to Oxford, tried, convicted, and executed. Some of the witnesses who appeared against him were the men who had informed against Shaftesbury. Two months later, Shaftesbury's secretary was committed to the Gatehouse on the charge of treason. The next stage was to tamper with a Captain Wilkinson, who was about to sail to South Carolina, of which he

had been appointed Lieutenant-Governor by Shaftesbury, who was one of the proprietors. This man was plied with temptations to testify to the use of treasonable language by Shaftesbury. He was then examined by the two Secretaries of State, and by the King himself; but he adhered stoutly to his denial of ever having heard any treasonable utterance by the prisoner. At last in November, a bill of indictment against Shaftesbury was presented at the Old Bailey. The Grand Jury was composed of substantial citizens. The Chief Justice who presided was Pemberton. In his charge he told the jurors that it was their business to see whether there were *prima facie* grounds for the charge, and, if there were, to find a true bill. This was inexact and irregular, but an equal irregularity followed. The Attorney-General prayed that the witnesses before the Grand Jury should be examined in open Court, and not in a private room. The jurors remonstrated, but their remonstrance was overruled. They then asked to see the warrant for Shaftesbury's commitment; but their request was also rejected. Various witnesses were examined and deposed to treasonable expressions on the part of the prisoner. They were severely cross-examined by the grand jurors, who retired to consider their evidence. When they returned into Court, the foreman handed in the bill endorsed with the word *Ignoramus*. As soon as this was known, vociferous acclamations arose, which were renewed for a whole hour, to the great scandal of the Court and the law officers of the Crown. At night bonfires were lighted, bells were rung, and the populace indulged in the noisiest manifestations of joy. Undoubtedly a great victory had been gained over the Court and over the Romanizing faction.

Just one week before Shaftesbury was indicted, the town was electrified by the appearance of a poem which appealed equally to the political and the personal predilections of the time, but the magnificent versification of which belongs to all time. "Absalom and Achitophel" is the poem, which, of all Dryden's numerous compositions, is best known to the present generation after "Alexander's Feast." Critics of our day read the descriptions of Achitophel and Zimri as the most perfect specimens of a terse and graphic style in the language. But the pleasure which these verses excite in us can but faintly approach the delight which they afforded to men who knew the originals; who had seen Buckingham jesting with Charles in the Mall, Monmouth bowing right and left to admiring crowds in the City, and Shaftesbury arguing points of law in the King's Bench. The poem is stated to have been written with the object of rousing the prejudices of the people against Shaftesbury. If so, it failed, as the decision of the Grand Jury shows. But although it failed



in this object, it succeeded in confirming and increasing the fame of its author. No work in that generation had such a wide and rapid circulation as this had, except only the narrative of Sacheverel's trial. Within a month after its publication, a second edition appeared. In this some notable additions were made. Amongst these was the following tribute to Shaftesbury's judicial merits :—

“ Yet fame deserved no enemy can grudge ;  
 The statesman we abhor, but praise the judge.  
 In Israel's Courts ne'er sat an Abethdin,  
 With more discerning eyes or hands more clean,  
 Unbribed, unsought, the wretched to redress,  
 Swift of despatch, and easy of access.”

Whether this eulogy was a compliment to Shaftesbury's good fortune in escaping the fangs of the law, or a tribute of compunction for the severity of the satire which preceded it, we cannot determine now. Indeed, it would be very difficult for us to explain the oscillations of praise and censure between which writers of that age so rapidly fluctuated. There was a general laxity of principle, and Dryden's principles were peculiarly unstable ; the politicians of the age were corrupt, and Dryden was only too amenable to changes of corruption ; poets too were ever an irritable race, and Dryden's irritability was alternately the subject of pity and of jest to his contemporaries. This tardy praise may have been suggested by the reflection that Shaftesbury might, after all, again become a powerful minister ; or by the latent sympathy which one man of genius feels towards another ; or possibly by spite to some one who hated Shaftesbury, but hated Dryden more.

The joy which Shaftesbury's victory excited, was not confined to the city ; it extended to the counties. Country gentlemen, whose loyalty to the Crown had been shaken by the dissoluteness of the Court, and whose loyalty to the Church had been alarmed by the aggressions of Romanism, exulted in the triumph of the great Protestant tribune. All the Whigs throughout the country rejoiced in the deliverance of the Whig leader. A medal was struck in honour of the event ; on one side was a portrait of Shaftesbury, on the other a sketch of the banks of the river, with the Bridge and the Tower, the sun shining through a cloud, and the inscription “ LÆTAMUR.” The appearance of this memorial stimulated the prolific genius of Dryden afresh. In March, 1682, within four months after the publication of “ *Abraham and Achitophel* ” his poem of the “ Medal ” was published. It is said to have been suggested by the King. It is not generally known or quoted now-a-days, nor are its verses

remarkable for anything except Dryden's habitual power of virulent abuse. They are vigorous enough, in all conscience, but they are as coarse and scurrilous as they are vigorous.

It is impossible to hold with Mr. Christie that misrepresentations alone caused the revulsion of feeling which soon showed itself towards Shaftesbury. The very poem of which we have just spoken, proves, what otherwise we might have expected, that the violent policy of Shaftesbury had, amidst much sympathetic applause, provoked much hostile reaction. While discontented Cavaliers, persecuted Presbyterians, and earnest anti-Romanists sympathized with the champion of Protestantism and the Exclusion Bill, there was a considerable section of the community which shrunk back from the probable consequences of his tactics. There was not a parsonage which had been violated by the inquisitive scrutiny of Cromwell's soldier-preachers, there was not a manor-house which had been stormed by the troopers of Fairfax, wherein alarm was not felt at the probability of another revolution and another civil war. It was right enough to support the Church and ward off Popery, thought the Cavalier squires and the country clergy, but it was rash and wanton to precipitate a conflict which might bring back the sway of another Cromwell and the yoke of vindictive Puritans. And such a conflict might be precipitated by the partisans of Monmouth. Such were the causes which prevented the consummation of Shaftesbury's victory. From the moment that the *Ignoramus* was greeted by acclamations, a reaction set in; and Shaftesbury's political sense felt the coming danger. The Court was successful in getting its adherents elected sheriffs. Tory sheriffs would nominate Tory juries; and if a new indictment were presented Shaftesbury had but little chance of a second escape. He began to consult his friends, and with Monmouth and Russell and others, considered the scheme of a general rising. Monmouth made an excursion into the north-western counties, and was arrested at Stafford on his return from Cheshire.

"Being brought to London," says Mr. Christie, "he was released on a *habeas corpus*, on bail, himself in 4000*l.*, and security of five friends in 2000*l.* each. Two of these were Lord Russell and Lord Grey. Shaftesbury at this time, both before Monmouth was brought to London and after, strongly advised that Monmouth should go back into Cheshire, and immediately head a rising; he answered for the City, if Lord Russell would head the insurrection there, and said he would put himself at the head of several thousands from Wapping and join Russell in the City. He had ten thousand brisk boys, he said, ready to rise. Russell counselled delay, and Monmouth concurred with Russell. About Michaelmas-day, Shaftesbury left Thanet House, fearing arrest, and lay for some weeks concealed in obscure houses in

the City and in Wapping; but from his concealment he urged and stimulated his friends. About the end of October or beginning of November, there was a meeting in the City at the house of Mr. Shepherd, a wine merchant, at which were present Monmouth, Russell, Lord Grey, Sir Thomas Armstrong, Colonel Rumsey, and Ferguson, a Scotch clergyman and friend of Shaftesbury, whom Dryden has scurrilously maligned.\* Ferguson made a report from Shaftesbury, and those present agreed to join with him in a rising, which was fixed for some eight or ten days after. Grey, on his way to the meeting, had seen Trenchard, and had received from him a favourable account of his preparations in Somersetshire. Sir William Courtney was looked to as leader in Devonshire. The plan of proceeding in London was, on this occasion, privately arranged. There was a second meeting at Shepherd's of the same persons before the day fixed for the rising. It was then reported that Trenchard could not be ready so soon at Taunton, and it was resolved to postpone for a few weeks the day of rising. This was the nineteenth of November. When Shaftesbury heard of Trenchard's backwardness, and of the consequent postponement, he determined to make his escape for Holland."†

The narrative of Lord Grey imputes rashness and recklessness to Shaftesbury. On the other hand, as Mr. Christie says:—

"Shaftesbury accused his associates of timidity, and concluded that no reliance could be placed on Trenchard. It is quite possible that Shaftesbury was wrong and Russell right. This is a matter of minor concern. It is very probable that grief, anxiety, excitement, and ill-

---

\* "Ferguson is described under the name of Judas in Dryden's portion of the second part of 'Absalom and Achitophel,' the bulk of which poem is from the very inferior pen of Nahum Tate:

'Shall that false Hebronite escape our curse,  
Judas, that keeps the rebels' pension-purse,  
Judas, that pays the treason-writer's fee,  
Judas, that well deserves his namesake's tree?'

Lord Macaulay has adopted Dryden's abuse of Ferguson; but Dryden's abuse of a 'rebel' is no authority. I have seen intercepted letters of Ferguson in the State Paper Office which give a favourable idea of his character. The utter unscrupulousness of Dryden's abuse is convincingly proved by his scurrilous treatment of another Scotch writer for Shaftesbury's party, James Forbes, who as Phaleg immediately follows Judas in the poem. I refer to my note on Phaleg in the Globe edition of Dryden's Poems, p. 161, for this proof."

† "The above narrative is derived and condensed from Lord Grey's 'Secret History of the Rye House Plot' (London, 1754), Rumsey's evidence on Walcott's trial, and Rumsey's and Lord Howard of Escrick's evidence on Lord Russell's trial. Dates and colourless facts may be taken on the authority of these traitors. That Shaftesbury, Russell, and the others consulted for a rising is undisputed. I do not take from any of these traitors statements inspired by personal feeling. Lord Grey's object is to throw odium chiefly on Shaftesbury, with whom he had not only been politically associated, but had lived on terms of friendly intimacy. He wrote his narrative to buy the favour of James II., and he was a thoroughly depraved man: Lord Howard of Escrick was another of the same sort."

ness had now impaired Shaftesbury's temper and judgment, shaken that once strong nerve, and weakened, perhaps unhinged, that great and vigorous mind. This would be matter for compassion rather than reproach and ridicule.

"It is more important to observe that Shaftesbury and Russell had embarked together in a scheme of insurrection which, if it succeeded, would be justified by success, and, if it failed, would be adjudged treason. On the main point of treasonable intent and act, there is no difference between Shaftesbury and Russell. It has been maintained by most writers that there was not at this time sufficient probability of success to justify a rebellion against the Government. It may or may not have been so. Success alone is held to justify rebellion. But how is success always to be ensured? Shaftesbury and his friends thought, when they consulted, that success might be attained; Monmouth, a military man, was very confident of success after a little waiting; Shaftesbury was more confident, and resented delay. Either of these was as likely to be right as any or most who, at a distance of time, judge that success was improbable. Charles II.'s misgovernment was now intense and inveterate; and this at least now-a-days will not be questioned, that subjects are justified, with a reasonable prospect of success, in rebelling against great misgovernment, otherwise irremediable; for the doctrines of divine right and unconditional non-resistance, which men like Burnet and Tillotson preached to Russell in his last days, and which Russell spurned at the cost of life, have long since gone to that limbo of disrepute into which many other devices of despots and fictions of priests have passed away.

Shaftesbury escaped, in the disguise of a Presbyterian minister, by way of Harwich, to Amsterdam, where he arrived in December. To protect himself from the danger of being delivered over to the English Government, he petitioned to be naturalized as a citizen of Amsterdam. The petition was granted, as five years later a similar petition was granted to Bishop Burnet in the reign of James II. But he did not long enjoy the security of this asylum. He was seized with gout at the end of December, and lingered in great agony until he died, on the 21st of January, 1683, in the sixty-second year of his age.

Of his character it is difficult to speak with definite precision. This difficulty is caused both by the complexity of the character itself, and by the rapid mutations of events in which he lived. It is also difficult to frame a judgment in direct opposition to that which has been pronounced by the most brilliant poet of one age and the most brilliant essayist of another. The dazzling rhetoric of Macaulay only repeats and intensifies the blow which was first struck by the mighty verse of Dryden. It is fearful odds to take up the gloves against Dryden, Butler, Hallam, and Macaulay. Yet this is the feat which Mr. Christie has ventured to undertake. The passion for redressing the scapegoats of his-

tory may as often proceed from a love of justice as from a love of paradox. We allow to the panegyrists of Robespierre and Tiberius the merit of preferring truth to injustice, and of being willing to face the trouble of correcting error rather than aid the servile propagation of its dogmas. Mr. Christie has not ventured on a task so unpopular or so unpromising as the defence of Robespierre or Tiberius, and Englishmen ought to be grateful for the industry and knowledge which he has exhibited in defending the character of the most eminent of Parliamentary leaders between the time of Clarendon and the time of Halifax. The result of his labour is not barren. If we do not agree that Shaftesbury deserves all the good that his last biographer says of him, we cannot but admit that he has not deserved the unmitigated reprehension which contemporary enmity and traditional prejudice managed to stamp on his private and public character.

First, as to his private character. Shaftesbury is accused by Dryden of the acts and the consequences of the grossest profligacy. We think the accusation wholly groundless. Shaftesbury lived in two distinct periods of our history; the one a period of rigid and enforced morality, the other of general and approved licentiousness. He was no Puritan when Puritanism was in the ascendant. Yet Puritan censors have chronicled no proven specific acts of profligacy against him. The aspersions on his morality became rife in an age when the generality of courtiers and politicians either were, or wished to be thought, immoral. It is hardly likely that if he was notoriously licentious at the time of the Commonwealth, he should have been a member of the Barebone's Parliament and of the Council of State. It is equally unlikely that, if he was ostensibly moral in the days of the Commonwealth, he should have broken out into flagrant immorality after the Restoration. Nor is it likely that a man who was thrice married, and whose private letters are full of the tenderness of his domestic affections, should have been guilty of extreme profligacy, unless we also impute to him a dark and habitual hypocrisy, which is inconsistent not only with the tenor of his general conduct, but with that of the satire by which he was most vehemently assailed. It is not likely that a man so beloved in his own family, by his own servants, and by such men as Locke, could have been systematically dissolute. But it is very likely that a man who took the foremost part in public affairs, who was a zealous, busy, and dexterous politician, a vehement and formidable debater, did in an age of violent factions, make many enemies, and that some of these enemies did avenge themselves on him by scurrilities which the loose morality of the age would most readily appreciate and believe. The infirmity which was caused by his accident at Breda suggested a calumny on which the dirty

hacks who scribbled in garrets could hardly be supposed to deny themselves the luxury of enlarging, and which would be far more damaging than the mere charge of sensuality.

But the defence of his public character is not so easy. Anthony Ashley Cooper filled too conspicuous a place in the eyes of men to escape remark. For thirty years he was an object, more or less, of public notice and comment. It was impossible not to know what he said and did in that time, although the motives of his acts and his words might be misconstrued. And his political career was certainly marked by glaring inconsistencies. He was, successively, a Colonel in the King's Army, and a "Field-Marshal-General" in the Army of the Parliament. He was a member of the Council of State under Cromwell; he was a member of the Parliamentary opposition to Cromwell; he was intimate with Cromwell; and — when Oliver was in his grave—he attacked his memory with unjustifiable abuse. He was a member of the Council of State under Richard Cromwell, and he intrigued with Monk to upset Richard Cromwell's government. He had served in the Parliamentary Army, and he was a most active co-operator with those who destroyed the power of that Army. He served under the Government which had put the King to death; and he sat as one of the judges who passed sentence of death on the men by whom the King had been condemned. At a critical epoch, when the restoration of Charles II. became morally certain, and when it was most desirable that his restoration should be fettered by restrictions, a statesman who had abandoned the Royal for the Parliamentary cause might be supposed to be especially earnest for the imposition of constitutional restrictions. Yet Cooper, who had left the cause of Charles I. for that of the Parliament, and that of the Parliament for that of Charles II., went to Breda and negotiated the return of Charles II. without any restrictions at all. As a member of the "Cabal," he helped to frame the Triple Alliance, the best measure of Charles's foreign policy. As a member of the same Ministry, he was instrumental in undoing his own good handiwork. Being a Protestant, and having been a Presbyterian, he humoured the personal prejudices of the King and the mercantile jealousies of the nation against our Protestant allies. In the office of the highest dignity and gravity, he condescended to stimulate the most ignoble passions of the nation by sounding the watchwords "Delenda est Carthago" against the Dutch. As Chancellor of the Exchequer, he tolerated the "stop of the Exchequer." As Lord Chancellor, he eloquently eulogized the goodness of the King in publishing his Declaration of Indulgence. As leader of the opposition, he denounced the Indulgence which he had belauded. He proposed penalties against known Papists and tests against suspected

Papists. He traded on the terror inspired by the Popish Plot. He magnified and encouraged the fears of the Protestant Alarmists. He threatened repeatedly, vigorously, and almost triumphantly, the succession of the Duke of York. He suggested and abetted the pretensions of the Duke of Monmouth. He was within an ace of anticipating the treason which cost that reckless youth his head a few years later. Finally, to escape the death of a traitor, he sought the death of an exile.

Such was his career. No one can deny that it was exciting, brilliant, meteoric. Few will assert that it was wholly unserviceable to mankind. As Cooper—as Lord Ashley—as Lord Shaftesbury, he riveted the attention first of a party, next of a people upon his conduct. By his dexterity as a tactician, by his eloquence and adroitness as a debater, and by the singular versatility of his opinions, he excited the wonder of all England. As the author of the Habeas Corpus Act he has earned the thanks of all sober lovers of liberty in all ages. On the whole, there is much in his career to inspire in us the sort of admiration which it inspired in his contemporaries. But it inspires nothing more. We do not rise from this most careful, thoughtful, and friendly biography with the sentiments which Mr. Christie feels towards his hero and desires to impart to us. But neither do we rise from it with the sentiments which found expression in the powerful invective of Dryden, or in the foul-mouthed vituperation of Otway. We admit much that Mr. Christie says so well and forcibly. We admit that in an age such as that in which Ashley Cooper lived change of opinion and change of policy are necessary conditions of life to many public men. We admit that English politicians of his own and of a later date changed their party and their professions as often as he did. We remember Monk and Montague and Manchester. We admit that French statesmen of the last thirty years have changed their politics and their professions with a readiness equal to that shown by the worst trimmers and turncoats of Charles's and William's reigns. We admit that Dryden, who assailed Shaftesbury, was a more unprincipled politician than the victim of his satire; and that he was venal, which Shaftesbury was not. But this defence, although good as a defence, is valueless as a panegyric. It is not sufficient to elevate its subject into the higher and purer sphere of those who by the consistent advocacy of great principles have vindicated their own profession of the noblest qualities and earned the profoundest veneration of mankind.

To us it seems that Shaftesbury does not rise much above the rank of a first-rate Parliamentary leader. This place cannot be denied him. The imperfect remains of his speeches show him to have been singularly, in those days unprecedentedly, powerful in debate. He was vigorous and subtle both in assault and de-

fence. He may be called the father and inventor of our modern debating. He all but ruled the House of Lords when the Lords ruled the opinions, if not the purses, of the people. This praise is due to him without qualification. But when we talk of great patriots and great statesmen, we think of other qualities and other names; the staid and steadfast courage of Hampden—the unquenchable resolution of Prynne—the self-devotion of Sidney and Russell—and the ardent love of England which neither disappointment nor disease could extinguish in the breast of Chatham. We think of that strong sense of duty which animated Washington in one age and Wellington in another, and we ask what claim has Shaftesbury to a place among such men?

It is not because he was inconsistent that we blame him, but because his inconsistencies were regulated by a prudential regard to times and circumstances. There is at least a modicum of truth in Butler's verses quoted by Mr. Christie:—

“H’ had seen three governments run down,  
And had a hand in every one;  
Was for ’em and against ’em all,  
But barbarous when they came to fall:  
For, by trepanning th’ old to ruin,  
He made his interest with the new one;  
Played true and faithful, though against  
His conscience, and was still advanced:  
For by the witchcraft of rebellion  
Transformed t’ a feeble state-chameleon,  
By giving aim from side to side  
He never failed to save his tide,  
But got the start of every state,  
And, at a change, ne’er came too late;  
Could turn his word, and oath, and faith,  
As many ways as in a lathe;  
By turning wriggle, like a screw,  
Int’ highest trust, and out for new.”

No one can read this biography and assert that Shaftesbury was inspired by an enthusiastic devotion to any principle of politics. His guiding principles were love of excitement and love of power. “The applause of listening Senates to command” was with him a joy hardly inferior to that of directing the Councils and dispensing the patronage of the Crown. The rapture of Parliamentary strife was to him as great a delight as the partition of Parliamentary spoils. His temperament, affected by his bodily maladies, found a pleasant counter-irritation in the conflicts of the Senate. The vanity which so often co-exists with temperaments like his was pleased and gratified by the attention, the wonder and the fear which he alternately excited. To head a great party; to inspire a strong feeling, either of fear or sym-



pathy ; to coax the King at one time ; to frighten him at another ; to be asked to take office ; to exchange the highest office for the power and applause belonging to the tribune of the people ; these were his pleasures and delights. And let it be acknowledged in justice to his memory that he sought neither office nor position for their money-value—that in an age when Englishmen of all parties, Tories and Whigs, patriots and courtiers—took money for their votes and their speeches ; when the King asked for French gold and Algernon Sidney did not refuse it, Shaftesbury was untainted by corruption. This would be no great praise in our days, but it was very great in his.

Mr. Christie will not be satisfied with our estimate of his hero. We cannot place him in the pure empyrean of those higher spirits who gave up their mortal lives to toil for the good of others. But we do recognise in him an ambition, an energy of mind, a power of work, and a power of debating, which cannot, indeed, by themselves entitle a man to the epithet of "great," but without which no Englishman in public life can hope to attain greatness. And we sincerely thank Mr. Christie for this his labour of love in placing before this generation so minute, complete, and interesting a record of one who was not only a consummate master of parliamentary eloquence, but a powerful leader of the English people in a most critical era of its history. It would be unjust to Shaftesbury to close this article without quoting two anecdotes which prove the keenness of discernment which he evinced on the ordinary occasions of life, and which doubtless guided him in his political strategy. The first story is—

"Soon after the restoration of King Charles the Second, the Earl of Southampton and he having dined together at the Chancellor's, as they were returning home he said to my Lord Southampton, 'Yonder Mrs. Ann Hyde (for so as I remember he styled her) is certainly married to one of the brothers.' The Earl, who was a friend to the Chancellor, treated this as a chimera, and asked him how so wild a fancy could get into his head. 'Assure yourself, sir,' replied he, 'it is so. A concealed respect, however suppressed, showed itself so plainly in the looks, voice, and manner wherewith her mother carved to her, or offered her of every dish, that it is impossible but it must be so.'"

"The second story is of Lord Ashley and Sir Richard Onslow having been invited to dinner by Sir John Denham, in order that he might have their advice about a project he had of marrying his housekeeper. The serious question having been formally opened to them for their opinion, Sir Richard Onslow was going to reply, when Lord Ashley interrupted him by asking Sir John a question which, in short, was this, 'whether he were not already married?' Sir John, after a little demur, answered, 'Yes, truly, he was married the day before.' Lord Ashley immediately replied that there was no need of their advice, and begged to be presented to the lady. As they

were returning to London in their coach, 'I am obliged to you,' said Sir Richard, 'for preventing my running into a discourse which could never have been forgiven me, if I had spoke out what I was going to say. But as for Sir John, he, methinks, ought to cut your throat for your civil question. How could it possibly enter into your head to ask a man who had solemnly invited us on purpose to have our advice about a marriage he intended, had gravely proposed the woman to us, and suffered us seriously to enter into the debate, whether he was already married or no?' 'The man and the manner,' replied Sir Anthony, 'gave me suspicion that, having done a foolish thing, he was desirous of covering himself with the authority of our advice.'"

---

#### ART. V.—THE DEVELOPMENT OF BELIEF.

1. *Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind.* By JAMES MILL, edited by J. S. MILL. Vol. I. Chap. XI. "Belief." With Notes by ALEXANDER BAIN and the EDITOR. Longmans: 1869.
2. *The Emotions and the Will.* By ALEXANDER BAIN. Part II. Chap. XI. "Belief." Longmans: 1865.
3. *On the Emotion of Conviction.* By WALTER BAGEHOT. *Contemporary Review*. April, 1871.

ONE often hears of the boldness of modern Science in the field of external nature—how persistently she continues to seize and to reduce to law its manifold mysteries. And one must be prepared to hear for many a day yet the impotent cry of men who see disappearing their dearest traditions of the situation and destiny of man in the universe of things. But if our bold adventuress creates alarm in the outer world, how far greater the consternation we may expect her to create when she penetrates the mysterious sanctuary of the mind. If a harmonious uniformity even in the world of matter must shape itself to timid minds as dire necessity, we may well be prepared for zealous protest against its transference to our own free domain of consciousness. Yet this new *Dea victrix* will never pause at sound of timid heart. She has already made sure her footing in this untried land, and her ardent worshippers already see the hour approaching when another fair temple will record the completion of her latest conquest.

It is, we think, nowise uncharitable to assert that much of the outcry against psychological analysis proceeds from a vague suspicion that to discover the roots of our thoughts may be to perceive their unsoundness. Most people with any pretence to culture have reflected enough to perceive how frequently ideas

and sentiments grow up without any rational basis. And they can hardly fail to see that a full development of mental science will throw a curious light on many a hidden nook of consciousness. The first impulse of the stronger mind in view of this timidity is to cry *mundus vult decipi ; ergo decipiatur*. But this temper is instantly checked, apart from considerations of a higher benevolence, by the reflection that any permanent prevention of enlightenment in this direction is beyond our powers. However much we may wish, we cannot long blind ourselves before the advancing light of day. People must soon come to see how they acquire their prejudices as well as their cognitions ; and one can only seek to accelerate a natural movement by helping to promulgate the luminous results which this branch of positive science has already reached.

The last stronghold which traditional sentiment has to defend against the assaults of natural explanation, appears to be human belief. It is plain that a scientific treatment of this phenomenon must awaken the strongest mode of resistance of that conservative force. To attempt any rational account of the phenomena of belief is to the common mind to threaten to disturb the foundations of some of the most sacred of human interests. Everybody perceives that belief, say in a given religious truth, is not a universal, invariable instinct ; and even cultured minds may be conscious that they are daily influenced by persuasions for which they could give no logical justification. This fact, however, does not much disturb them so long as they are not compelled to think about it ; but when psychology proposes to open up the secret processes of the mind, and to trace step by step the growth of their prevailing creeds, these same people resent the proposal as an unnecessary rupture of their mental quietude. The explanation of this attitude is not, we think, difficult to find. However much a person may have observed his fellow-creatures, he does not acquire a proper idea of the *contingency* of all belief until he gives some attention to its causes. He may hear others denying that they participate in some one of his intensest convictions, but he still imagines they must possess the belief, though perhaps obscured by other mental growths. Without any practice in psychological analysis, his subjective necessity always tends to appear as an objective one. But once get him to see that belief varies with certain assignable circumstances, such as emotional temperament or previous education, and the all-sufficiency of this subjective necessity begins to disappear. He at once conceives that some possible variation in his past experiences would have left him without one of these invincible convictions. In other words, the logical bearings of psychological research would faintly reveal themselves to his vision.

This seems to be the somewhat painful process which recent

inquiries into the first germinations of belief are occasioning in many intelligent minds. The causes which have operated in throwing this study more particularly on the hands of the present generation are worthy of being noticed. On the one hand the great stimulus given to the study of human evolution as revealed in history, &c., and more especially to that of primitive man, his ideas and habits, has served to bring prominently into view the action of circumstances in modifying human belief, while it has exhibited among the most unlike varieties of the race the universality of certain believing tendencies or instincts. On the other side, psychological analysis has been carried forward to a point of greater exactness; and in this manner subjective reflection, assisted and corrected—as it ever must be—by wide historical information, has been attracted to the phenomena of belief is a distinct and urgent problem in the science of mind. That even after this problem had been recognised its answer did not readily appear, follows from the intricacy of the phenomena concerned. Belief, however simple a thing it appears at first sight, is really a highly composite state of mind, or at least involves the presence of numerous other forms of consciousness. Thus, to give but one example, it is easily seen that every belief implies ideas, and that the laws of the one must somehow or other be influenced by the laws of the other. Consequently the science of ideas, their formation, and the order of their recurrence, has to precede the science of belief. Agreeably to this, we find that the question of the precise nature and laws of belief, though it has for some while received special attention from British psychologists, still remains to a considerable degree an open one.

According to the old methods of psychology, by which the mind was regarded as a group of certain popularly distinguished faculties or powers, the subject of belief was easily overlooked. The various manifestations of confidence, such as intuition, memory, inference, were sharply separated by the writers of that class as having nothing in common. On the other hand the opposite school of thinkers, who were a little too eager to resolve all mental states into modes of one fundamental process, the operation of association, readily overlooked the cardinal psychological difference between simply conceiving something, and believing in it as an actuality. Among writers of this school, Hume seems to have perceived in belief something more than mere ideation, or the play of ideas. He speaks frequently of this phenomenon as a *sentiment*, and he appears to have regarded it as an ultimate fact, though governed by the conditions of association and habit.\*

---

\* "The difference between fiction and belief lies in some sentiment or feeling which is annexed to the latter, and not to the former."—"An Inquiry Concerning the Human Understanding," sect. v. part ii.

Since the subject has been brought into prominent notice, two distinct inquiries have presented themselves. First of all, it has been asked whether belief is an elementary or a derivative state of mind—that is, whether, like our ideas of extension or moral rightness, it can be traced back to the union of certain simpler states of mind, or whether it is as much a primitive unanalysable state of consciousness as the sensation of blueness or the pain of a bodily hurt. Secondly, the question has been raised more or less distinctly whether, supposing the phenomenon is indivisible and unique, it does not always follow other mental states as its conditions, and what number of pre-existing phenomena must be reckoned among these conditions. To make the latter inquiry plain, we must again refer to the analogy of other mental phenomena. A sensation, for instance, is treated by the psychologist as an ultimate datum, the causes of which are for him only a secondary study. Although every sensation follows certain physiological processes, within the realm of mind proper it forms the first link in the chain of explanation. On the other hand, an idea is not such an ultimate datum, but is known to have as its conditions a previous sensation and a medium of reproduction. The question, then, may be put thus: Does belief, as to its origin, resemble a sensation or an idea?

With respect to the first point, an attempt was made by James Mill, in his celebrated "Analysis," to resolve all cases of belief into mere forms of inseparable association. When we believe in the past or future conjunction of two events, the process, he thinks, is nothing but the operation of an irresistible attraction between the corresponding ideas, so that we cannot think of the one event except as accompanied by the second. This view ignores, as we have already hinted, the difference between imagination and belief—ideas which point to some objective fact beyond themselves, and those which have no such reference; and on this ground Mr. J. S. Mill deems it to be unsatisfactory. If belief were nothing but a transformation of inseparably associated ideas, then, as Mr. Mill says, every case of such association would develop belief. But as a matter of fact we are frequently compelled, as in the case of the apparent motion of the sun, to conceive events in one way and to believe them in another. Another and far more elaborate attempt to resolve belief into simpler psychological phenomena has since been made by Professor Bain. It is one of the great merits of this eminent psychologist that he has brought into a juster prominence the active side of the human mind. By the addition of the phenomena of spontaneous activity and muscular sensibility to what may in contrast be called our passive sensations, he has been able to place in a perfectly new light such psychological problems as the origin of our ideas of space and matter,

and the growth of volition. To this same region of consciousness Mr. Bain refers the peculiar state of mind which we term belief. His theory is a little complicated, and we can give only its more essential points. We all admit, says this writer, that the proper result and infallible test of belief is to be found in a man's actions. Unless a professed creed is seen to affect the course of the individual's conduct we doubt his sincerity, while promptness and unwavering persistence in action are always accepted as a proof of intensity of conviction. Now, Mr. Bain adds, not only is readiness to act the sure outcome and test of belief, it is the essence of the believing state itself. Through the fact of our natural spontaneity we are ever ready, previous to experience, to act somehow. This state of mind may, so far as we understand our author, be termed the force of belief in the abstract, viewed, as we view material force in mechanics, without any reference to direction or other concrete circumstances. In order that it may become the concrete state of mind which we know as confidence, some suggestion of ideas consequent on a measure of experience, however limited, is necessary. Yet this atom of experience, though needed to give an object or a definite direction to belief, does not constitute or even, at first at least, determine its force. The first expectations of young children, following it may be a single accidental conjunction of events, cannot be said to owe their intensity to the amount of experience. The force of those beliefs was a pre-existing force, the readiness "to act and follow out every opening;" it did not spring from the experience, but was simply turned by it into one particular channel. Subsequent experiences no doubt considerably modify these crude beliefs, but the process is throughout the same. Repeated concurrences of an experience will cause this active impulse to take a certain direction more decidedly, while discrepancies among our single experiences leave the mind without any clear line of action and so give rise to the opposite state of doubt. Yet in all these cases the prime force which determines the degree of confidence in any direction is the spontaneous impulsiveness already spoken of. Experience can do nothing but open or close channels of operation for this force. To use Mr. Bain's own words:—

"The force of belief is, then, not one rising from zero to a full development by slow degrees, according to the length of experience. We must treat it rather as a strong primitive manifestation derived from the natural activity of the system." "It is the active prompting of the mind itself that instigates, and in fact constitutes, the believing temper; unbelief is an after-product, and not the primitive tendency. Indeed, we may say that the unborn energy of the brain gives faith, and experience scepticism."\*

---

\* "Emotions and Will," p. 539.

We think this affiliation of belief on the active side of human nature to involve a real progress towards the solution of the problem. So far as Mr. Bain brings to light the operation of natural activity as an important *condition* of belief we think his position is above all attack. But we are unable to see how belief is in any way resolvable into activity. Our readers will at once see that this question is merely a case of the difference already explained between analysing a mental state into other and simpler states, and assigning to it certain pre-existent states as its conditions. The point is a difficult one, and we offer our own view of it, diverging as it slightly does from that of so profound a psychologist, with a considerable measure of hesitation.

First of all then, we would call attention to the generic difference which subjective reflection discovers between the two states of mind—activity, or proneness to action, and belief. Mr. Bain appears to find in the former all the essential characteristics of the latter, but we think to most persons they are fundamentally distinct. And just as they are *prima facie* heterogeneous states of mind, so it appears to us impossible to derive one from the other according to any known mental laws. At first sight it does seem that, given an original spontaneous force predisposing to action, plus a conjunction of ideas offering a channel for action, we are able *à priori* to infer the existence of belief. But in truth this is only in appearance. All that we could so infer, as a necessary consequence of these data, is *action*, in a given direction, but not *belief*.\* From a strong inclination to act somehow, and the presentation of a certain course of action (by a process of association), we see that action must follow. But no one could ever have predicted from these conditions that along with this turning of the stream of active energy into a particular channel there would present itself this new and unique phenomenon, expectation or confidence. In other words, belief does not seem to be involved in this spontaneous action. If we take another stage of action to which Mr. Bain frequently refers we shall see the same difficulty in detecting any *à priori* reasons for belief. When a child's spontaneous action happens to run into a line of action leading to pleasure, Mr. Bain holds that by the law of self-conservation the action will tend to sustain itself. Pleasure being supposed to further the vigour of the system, the course of successful action becomes more and more

---

\* It is worthy of remark that Mr. Bain does employ the elementary facts of our active constitution, together with association, to derive the phenomena of volition; and in this case, we think, he has succeeded most completely in showing the will to be a secondary and composite state of mind, inferrible from more rudimentary states. A comparison of this analysis with that of belief will serve, we think, to bring out the superiority of the former.

intense. This is easily conceivable. But Mr. Bain proceeds to add, that in the mental disposition of this moment there is involved the highest confidence. "There is no hesitation, no distrust, nothing but exuberant unrestrained activity."\* Again we feel ourselves compelled to ask why need confidence be present at all? Why could not the pleasurable activity go on without the least semblance of hope? As a matter of fact we doubt whether the state produced under these circumstances can correctly be called belief till the experience has been sufficient to allow of something like the return of an idea—but of this further on. At any rate we are incapable of finding in either of these modes of activity any necessity for the believing state.

Just as we do not find belief involved in activity, so we can conceive and may find belief without any accompanying activity. No doubt in the structure of our mental constitution belief is most intimately connected with action; yet there is surely no contradiction in conceiving a mind perfectly destitute of action participating in this feeling. We can readily represent to ourselves the case of a helpless paralytic, carefully tended by nurses, who might come to anticipate periodic recurrences of his comforts, and feel at the signs of their approach all that elation of mind which is just as much an effect of confidence as action itself. Mr. Bain admits that in mature life our beliefs become detached from this primitive root of activity, so that we hold to doctrines without any immediate reference to acting upon them. But so far as we can judge this non-active mode of belief is just as elementary as the other, and frequently appears simultaneously with it. The common illustration of this form of belief is found in the first anticipations of pain. In the trite illustration of the child that has once burnt its finger we have a case of strong belief produced in direct opposition to the force of spontaneous activity. Mr. Bain distinctly says that these first experiences of pain are a direct check to spontaneity. In children of unrobust constitution a single instance of painful check is enough to prostrate action for some considerable while, the mind being now under the sway of what we may in distinction call a passive belief, the confidence in an impending evil. But if activity be the one great source of belief, how is it possible to account for this confidence, springing up just as certainly and persisting just as forcibly as the other, when spontaneity is reduced to its minimum? We know that in many of these cases when spontaneity is high the painful collision produces only a subsequent doubt; but this doubt is only a mean state between two extremes of belief, one of which appears when the tide of active energy is at its

---

\* Note to Mill's "Analysis," vol. i. p. 397.



lowest. We know also that a repetition of such painful experiences in a vigorous mind is the occasion of a new form of what we may call active belief—viz., a confidence in our power of avoiding the evil. But this is in most cases a later growth, requiring lapse of time and frequent experiments in action, and does not affect the importance of the intermediate state of painful anticipation, unless indeed we were to refuse to apply the name belief to sure anticipation of evil as well as to that of good.

If it is possible to find in certain forms of anticipation belief which does not spring from activity, we may assert this with still greater confidence of memory. This is surely a distinct mode of confidence not resolvable into any anticipations actual or imaginary. When with a present idea I have an assurance of a past reality, this phenomenon is peculiar, and we think inexplicable by any reference to action. Yet Mr. Bain thinks our belief in a past sensation is still resolvable into a readiness to act upon it; or, where there is no prospect of action, into a state of feeling similar to that which we cherish towards impressions which we are ready to act on. The last case is thus illustrated: "I believe that I yesterday ran up against a wall to keep out of the way of a carriage. I have no disposition to do anything in consequence of that conviction; yet I call it a conviction, and not a mere notion, because I am affected by it in the same way as I am by another recollection that I do act upon. I feel that if there were any likelihood of being jammed up in that spot again, I should not go that way if I could help it."\* So that here too there is "still a reference to action more or less remote." This theory appears to us altogether to overlook the fact that belief in memory is a distinct species of confidence, which may be the ground of future action but owes nothing of its strength to this fact.

We hold then that belief, though commonly bearing the closest relation to action, is not reducible to any form of activity, since the various forms of such activity are perfectly conceivable without any belief, and more than this, belief often appears in which no effect of activity is perceptible. How then, it will be asked, does action relate itself to belief? If activity is not the raw material of belief, nor its invariable condition, what is the connexion between the two? This question conducts us to the solution of the general problem of the derivation and causation of belief.

We have tried to show that belief cannot be resolved into inseparability of association or into the primitive activity of the system; and this may suffice for establishing the distinct and

---

\* "Emotions and Will," p. 554.

unique character of the phenomenon.\* In support of this conclusion, we are glad to be able to appeal to so great a psychological authority as Mr. J. S. Mill. After examining the phenomena of belief, more especially in their relation to inseparable association, he finds the difference between a mere combination of ideas, and one which recalls to us a combination of sensations as actually experienced, something which "always returns on our hands as an ultimate postulate."†

The only question now remaining concerns the conditions by which the direction and intensity of belief are determined. What these are and how they act will now be considered. And in doing so we shall be able, we trust, to assign the kind and measure of influence due to our active impulses.

We have already alluded to the great intricacy of the phenomena of belief. This intricacy arises chiefly from the number of varying influences or conditions to which it is subject. Although the belief of the savan in his verified theory and the confidence of a savage in the efficacy of his bloody rite, are psychologically one and the same state, the mental conditions which surround and shape the beliefs in the two cases appear to render them utterly unlike. How numerous and complex these conditions are, each one of us may learn to some extent by carefully observing his own mental history. He will in so doing be impressed by the fluctuations of his belief in certain future ends, which fluctuations he will often find it impossible to account for. However logical and deliberate he may be in weighing evidence and suspending judgment, he will pretty certainly find cases in which influences lying beyond the region of evidence have had their sway. In matters of demonstrative certainty, as Mr. Bain well says, there is little room for these variations of confidence; but "as we pass from the highest order of certainty, through the stages of probability, down to the depths of total uncertainty, we come more and more under the domination of the physical and moral causes that maintain or destroy the cheerful, buoyant, and happy frame of mind." To observe and group together these various sources of the believing temper, and to connect them with those logical forces which sustain the permanent belief of well regulated minds, is, we think, the great problem of psychology in reference to this subject. Mr. Bain, whose authority in favour of so large a part of our theory we are glad to appeal to,

---

\* The question of belief being a form of intensity, or fixity of idea, is not discussed here. Most writers who have laid emphasis on this influence have still regarded belief as something *sui generis*, though the result of such ideal excitement.

† Mill's "Analysis," vol. i. Editor's Note, p. 416 *et seq.*  
[Vol. XCVII. No. CXCL.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. XLI. No. I.

finds the modifying influences of belief, those which in his view supplement and interfere with the force of primitive activity, to be the laws of association, and the control exercised by the feelings. The second of these forces has been treated by him with a masterly completeness, and our task in reference to it will be simply to follow out his principles into some of their numerous ramifications. The effects of association are much more obvious, and offer less room for divergence of opinion—as indeed is shown by the tendency of writers to refer to this process all the effects of belief. Yet even here we venture to think something has still to be done towards accounting for some of the more complicated intellectual developments of belief. The operation of spontaneous activity in nourishing belief, as distinguished from its effect on voluntary action, we shall endeavour to refer to the laws of feeling or emotional excitement in general. Finally, reference will be made to the question how far the will is able to check or otherwise control the impulses of our believing nature. Thus we have to examine in order the development of the Intellectual, Emotional and Volitional conditions of belief.

In discussing the intellectual conditions of belief, an obvious and useful principle of arrangement is offered us in the distinction between the direct effects of experience and other intellectual influences not due to experience. That is to say, we may trace out the process by which persisting impressions give rise to expectations of similar experiences; and secondly examine into those curious intellectual operations out of which spring so many of the subjective and unverified beliefs of the human mind. When we turn to the first effects of experience on belief, we find ourselves again approaching the question of the derivability of this mental state. Mr. Bain, as we have seen, finds the believing impulse at work prior to all experience—namely, in the outgoings of activity. We have sought to show that belief is something elementary and unique, and the only point we need now consider is, whether it ever presents itself as a spontaneous instinct previous to experience. The simplest case of actual belief Mr. Bain appears to find in the confidence which a young child, or one of the lower animals, manifests when happening to light on some momentary good luck. Under these circumstances we find action sustained, and all the expression of a joyous assurance. Hence Mr. Bain concludes\* that “the situation contains all that is meant by full and unbounded confidence that the future and the distant will be exactly what the present is.” Similarly with respect to belief in memory. “At first we make

\* Note to Mill's “Analysis,” p. 396 *et seq.*

no radical difference between a present and a proximate past. . . . At the moment of active thirst I, in the absence of corrective influences, . . . would be disposed to believe that I always was, and always would be thirsty." And the believing in the past reality of an idea is due to this tendency of a present state of mind to fill up as it were the empty channels of the past and future. For the idea, when the experience is a proximate past, is scarcely less intense than the activity-itself. These suppositions represent of course extreme, and we should be apt to add, imaginary cases, for long before any ideas of past and future presented themselves with any distinctness, a number of various experiences would have happened, and to the actual state of the moment would most probably be added ideas of these remembered states. Yet accepting this abstract statement of the case, we shall see that even here belief does not precede but follows, or at least is contemporaneous with experience and association. So far as the present actual state has a tendency to beget an expectation of a like succeeding state, or a quasi-recollection of a like antecedent state, it must be due to the fact that, all other suggestions being absent, the present reality supplies the only possible idea for both the immediate future and the immediate past. And this is the simplest conceivable mode of experience begetting a form of belief. Still this hypothetical case appears to us to illustrate not the simplest form of belief, but the point where belief and realization, ideas and sensations, melt into one and are no longer distinguishable. Belief, whether in a coming or a past experience, can only begin with some idea of those experiences, and this idea must be distinguishable from a present fruition of the experience.

The simplest manifestation of belief in young children and the lower animals is undoubtedly expectation. The case of memory is somewhat more difficult. It probably comes later than expectation in the course of mental development, and certainly its objective signs are more difficult to be detected. It is to be remarked here, as Mr. Bain reminds us, that the first powerful suggestion of an approaching evil or good acts on the young mind much as the real experience itself. The horse that hears the rustling of its oats, or the child that watches the preparation of its bath, exhibits signs of a state of mind scarcely distinguishable from the realization of these experiences. This is the first effect of an idea powerfully suggested. But let there be a momentary delay in the attainment of the enjoyment, the mind has time enough now to pass backward and forward from the idea of the approaching experience to the actual sensation of the moment. By such indescribably rapid alternations of mental state, we may suppose the idea of some-

thing as not actual yet approaching to become a distinct element of consciousness. The only point then that seems to require explanation, is why the idea should present itself as a coming experience rather than as a past.

This question we shall seek to answer when we have considered an elementary case of memory. To take the one given us by Mr. Bain, imagine a young child whose thirst has just been allayed. The idea of this thirst will remain for a while in spite of the opposite actual state succeeding it. The point now to be explained, says Mr. Bain, is not why the child believes he has the idea of thirst, but why he believes this idea was lately a full actuality as much as the present state of satisfied sensation. In each of these cases a vivid idea coexists, or more strictly alternates, with a present sensation, yet in the one case the mental result is an expectation, in the other a recollection. In the first the effect is an active one stimulating the energies of the system to hasten the coming fruition; in the second, the effect is passive, no effort being made to avert the thirst as though it were a state about to return. Here then we appear to have reached the two independent roots out of which all belief springs. Mr. Mill rightly holds that every belief is an instance of either memory or expectation; and we are now conducted to their most rudimentary forms without being able apparently to derive one from the other, or to connect them both with some one more fundamental fact.

Nevertheless, we feel constrained to make one more effort to unite the two. While fully convinced that if we retrace the development of belief we reach at last these inexplicable rudiments—expectation and memory, we may still endeavour to determine the conditions which cause an idea to appear now under the one form and now under the other. A recent attempt has been made by M. Taine in his work "*De l'Intelligence*," to supply these conditions, and though his explanation contains much that is fanciful and unnecessary it comes so near to what strikes us as the truth of the matter that we cannot do better than make it the starting-point of our remarks.

M. Taine conceives our various sensations to be divisible into parts, of which the most important are the two extremities, the commencement and the termination. Each of these extremities must be supposed to cohere with the adjacent extremity of the preceding or succeeding sensations, just as the various adjacent parts of the same sensation cohere together. Thus the whole series of our sensations must be conceived as made up of molecular parts (having dimensions in time only) by the mutual cohesion of which the whole is fused into one. Now when any idea is suggested to the mind it is at first antagonistic to the

actual sensation or other state of mind of the moment. This antagonism, however, soon ceases, and its cessation is effected by means of the mechanism just described. The new idea ceases to clash with the present sensation when it enters into one form of this contact with it, that is to say, when either its anterior extremity touches the other's posterior, or its posterior extremity adjusts itself to the other's anterior. Which of these arrangements it will light on in any given case depends on the previous relation of the sensations. Thus, if the sensation B has commonly followed the sensation A, the idea of B will slide *in front* of the present sensation A, and appear as an expectation or prevision; or if B is the sensation of the moment, the idea of A will slide *behind* it, and present itself as a memory. Such is, we think, the substance of M. Taine's theory so far as it bears on our immediate problem.\* While rejecting much of M. Taine's theory as wild hypothesis, and objecting to his phraseology as too figurative and inexact, we think he suggests considerations which throw a real light on the mental process. It appears to us that psychologists, in analysing the mind into sensations and ideas have been too apt to look at these as isolated phenomena, whereas in our actual experience they are closely combined; of these combinations, the simplest, most universal, and most impressive one is that of antecedent and consequent. When, for instance, I experience in succession the two sensations, a yellow disk of a particular kind, and the peculiar taste of an orange, it is not a complete account of this fragment of my mental history to enumerate these sensations, for, in addition to the single sensations, I had the peculiar state of consciousness known as a transition from one sensation to another, and consequently, when I think of it afterwards, the idea in my mind is of the first visual sensation giving place to the second gustatory. When the consecutive sensations are strongly contrasted the transitions are more impressive. For instance, when the sensations a child receives from the visible preparation of its food give place to the new group of feelings excited by eating, the passage is a very impressive element of consciousness, and when these first sensations are again excited, they tend to awaken the idea of this transition also. Herein there seems to lie the explanation of an idea's assuming now the form of an expectation, now that of a recollection. In the former case the idea is called up, not as a detached mental phenomenon, but as the second term of a relation, the state into which the actual one strives to transform itself. In other words, to borrow M. Taine's figure,

---

\* See "De l'Intelligence," tome second, livre iii., sections vii. and ix. This interesting work has recently been translated by Mr. T. D. Haye.

the idea seems to place itself in front of the present ruling sensation, and thus we have shadowed forth in its most primitive form the idea of futurity. When, on the other hand, the idea presents itself as a recollection, it is accompanied by a revived feeling of its transition to the present dominant sensation. Thus, to refer again to Mr. Bain's example, the child whose thirst has just been allayed has with the recurring idea of the thirst, and as an integral part of the same, the renewed sense of its displacement by the present feeling of satisfaction. In other words, the idea is an idea of something connected in the peculiar relation of priority with the actual experience of the moment. Thus, given a certain elementary experience of sequent impressions, and the power of revival in our sensations, it appears that the differentiation of anticipation and recollection, future and past, is to some extent explicable. At the same time it should be added, that the question why, in either of these cases, any belief at all manifests itself, is just as insoluble as it was before. The force of belief must be postulated, and all that we can do is to say why it should take this form rather than another.

Although we have here spoken of expectation and memory as springing up simultaneously by nearly the same mental process, it is probable that in the actual development of belief the first appears long before the second. In the earliest stages of the child's mental history, the vague though intense ideas suggested by association are scarcely realized as expectations or recollections. As will be shown when we come to speak of the influence of emotional colouring on the belief-creating power of ideas, all indifferent ideas appear at this period to flit through consciousness without exciting notice; only the deeply interesting ideas of pleasure and pain are detained. When the mind comes under the influence of such a strongly coloured idea the state is at first, as we have already remarked, scarcely distinguishable from the real experience which generated the idea. But suppose this exciting hue of the idea to be toned down so as to permit of a slight amount of intellectual activity. The child can now no longer yield its mind up to the idea as to a full reality; perception of the immediate circumstances of the moment rapidly alternates with the sway of the idea; and in these alternations the idea tends to assume a more distinct form in relation to the present reality. If it represents a pleasure or pain usually experienced *after* the present impression, the mind moves exactly in the order of actual experience from the present to its succeeding state. Every recurrence to this observation of the actual is but a step back again towards this idea of a coming experience, and the mind resting in this latter state easily comes to know the meaning of expectation. When, however, the idea

is of something commonly preceding the impression of the moment just the reverse process takes place. The idea, say of the recently experienced thirst, recurring by mere force of persistence, tends as soon as it is aroused to call up in the manner already described its following state—that is, it leads us back to the present reality in which we are now disposed to rest rather than in the idea. Thus it would appear that even after the intellectual conditions of memory present themselves, actual recollection may be highly vague and fugitive in character, whereas anticipation may at the same time be strongly developed. At the same time, it is clear that by the play of our voluntary activity, all ideas of the future, or expectations, come to derive a new importance, and to persist in consciousness as the servants of volition in the shape of active ends.

How far very young children and the lower animals experience anything analogous to our mature recollections, it is very difficult to say. The growth of memory as a distinct department of mental life is an exceedingly intricate process, and all our attempts to trace out its stages must be regarded as mere suggestions of the truth.

We have here supposed that the tendency of ideal revival is at first in the forward direction only, that is, that any idea tends to call up its consequent, though not necessarily its antecedent. Hence, one of the reasons possibly why anticipation is at first so much in advance of memory. The fact that the idea of any past impression at once gives place to those of its succeeding experiences prevents its becoming a distinct matter of consciousness. How far the power of an idea to call up its predecessor is an integral part of the law of contiguous association may be open to doubt. We are all familiar with cases of contiguous impressions which recall one another only in the forward direction, as, for example, in repeating the alphabet; and it might be urged with some show of reason that all our retrogressive revivals of impressions are brought about by means of added and artificial associations, especially those of language, acting in a forward direction. But leaving this an open question, we may safely say that it is only after a certain degree of intellectual development that the mind is able to move backwards to a point of experience behind the present. The common division of time into certain equal segments and equidistant points is a great auxiliary to this process. After a considerable number of experiences the child comes to know that every present impression has some antecedent, this another antecedent, and so on. And it is only when the mind is capable of going back over a few definite fixed points to the idea of some distant experience, and returning by the normal route of actual



experience to the present, that a proper and complete conception of a past fact is formed. What the whole of the idea of this past exactly implies in addition to this double movement of the mind, has been clearly and fully set forth by James Mill.

With respect to the origin of belief in the reality of these ideas, we have already given it as our opinion that it must be accepted as an ultimate phenomenon of the mind. Only one point in this process may perhaps be touched upon with advantage—namely, the circumstances in which we come to dwell on our past impressions, and make them the distinct objects of believing consciousness. We have assumed that whenever a present impression calls up an idea of some succeeding experience we have an anticipation, as distinct from a recollection; yet it is evident that in our adult life it may frequently resolve itself just as easily into a memory, as when, for instance, the sight of the falling snow at once recalls the pleasure of a sleigh drive experienced abroad, without apparently the least tendency to pass into an anticipation of a similar enjoyment. It is a question, we think, whether we should ever feel anything but anticipation under these circumstances were our experiences a perfectly regular recurrence of a serial order, so that an impression *a* was always followed by *b*, and *b* by *c*, and so on. Our falling back on memory in these instances is due to the frequent checks which our first instinctive anticipations have met with. Let us imagine a child receiving one of these early disappointments. The arrival of a certain person has been accompanied in one or two instances by the donation of an orange. When the individual next comes it has forgotten its customary generosity, and the child's mind passes from the tension of full hope to the painful experience of disappointed trust. While it is thus in suspense the intellectual forces are in full play through the general tone of mental excitement, and by rapid flights and reflights from the present to the past—brought out now into such bold contrast with the present—it becomes acutely aware of the independent existence of the past. In the painful conflict of mind here experienced we have sharply differentiated a belief in past experience; and in this conviction, together with a feeling of the falsity of the present assurance, we have a rudimentary form of that mental condition out of which all our later judgments arise. Henceforth the child will begin to attend distinctly to the grounds of each new expectation, to recall and be sure of the previous experiences, and in this manner to make memory the starting-point of anticipation, the known the clue to the unknown.

Fully to trace out the development of all our beliefs as regulated by experience and association would require far too much space; and we may well pass over these details, as they

have been so ably expounded by previous writers. The principal influences at work are, we may just say, the repetition and apparent contradiction of our various experiences. By means of these we come not only to attend to the past as a logical basis of our inferences, but to compare and to unite the various elements of this past under exacter notions of permanent sequences, as distinguished from accidental and ill-observed conjunctions. In this way the more subtle and deep-lying conditions of expectation reveal themselves to the mind, and our beliefs tend to approximate to logical conclusions. In like manner, too, the various modes of connexion between phenomena come to be recognised, and the mind acquires those notions of co-existence, sequence, and permanent existence which it is the province of logic to define and arrange. How languages assist us in marking off the past from the future, the premiss from the conclusion, and in giving a new persistence, a due exactness, and so a universal applicability to the products of experience as contained in memory—all this has been so fully demonstrated by Mr. Mill in connexion with logical evidence that we may simply refer the reader to his great work on that subject. Suffice it to say, that in the properly regulated mind such education through memory and reflection transforms our first instinct to pass to a future, in all respects like the past, into a distinct consciousness of certain normal relations of uniformity in nature, and a deliberate repose on clearly ascertained facts as an all-sufficing foundation for belief.

The other grand influence in transforming our first crude beliefs into exact conclusions of reason is the general culture of the mind, more especially the development of the conceptive faculty. Hitherto we have spoken only of the simplest illustrations of anticipation, where a present impression irresistibly suggests the idea of a coming good or evil. But with the progress of culture our believing minds begin to reach forward to more distant points of support. Instead of previsions of the immediate future, we now indulge in anticipations of events removed by intervals of months and years from the present. Not only so, but we project ourselves in imagination to points in time too remote ever to fall within the bounds of our individual experience. We pass from the data of historical monuments or authoritative tradition to a belief in facts, which we might have witnessed under the supposition of our being at a certain place at a certain remote point of time; or we ascend in thought to the celestial worlds, which our distant observations tell us to be the realities of our nocturnal luminaries, and firmly persuade ourselves of the impressions which a near observer might experience. Finally, the scientific mind gathers up all such credible

conceptions, branching out in all directions of space and time, and formulates them as general laws, physical or moral. Every one of these general propositions stands for an indefinite number of expectations both positive and conditional.\* The number of our own actual experiences of the given fact may be small enough; and yet we do not hesitate to cast ourselves, in thought at least if not in action, on this indefinitely wide range of conceivable experiences. We have now ceased to draw our crude childish inferences of a world revolving about us like some painted cylinder, with all its different pictures occurring in exactly the same order, and have expanded our field of vision to a world with no clearly marked limits in space or time, a vast painted canvas for ever moving onwards before the eye, in which at first sight nothing but most intricate and various groupings of coloured forms are discoverable, subtly woven lines that intersect in ever fresh arabesque forms, but in which the measuring eye of the geometer discovers unfailing uniformities of relation, resolving every picturesque complex into a modified combination of a few elementary lines and surfaces.

Thus far we have regarded simply those intellectual conditions of belief which represent the direct effects of our experiences. It has been assumed as an ultimate postulate that an idea begotten of a real impression carries with it some recognisable mark of this fact, so that when it presents itself in consciousness our attention is diverted from the present counter or symbol to some absent reality. This indicative attitude of an idea is of a twofold character, referring both to the actual past, or known, and to the possible future, or unknown, and we have sought to give the mental circumstances which cause now the one and now the other aspect to prevail over our attention, without in the least explaining why the idea should have any reference to something beyond itself. So long as this objective reference of an idea is only found when the idea is the product of sensation or fact, and so long as it exactly corresponds in time and circumstances to the order of the fact, this part of our mental mechanism must be looked on as the most valuable and essential to all true knowledge and safe action. But this is by no means the exact truth. First of all, our ideas often deviate in their arrangement from the exact connexions of our experience; and secondly, other ideas born of all manner of sources come to usurp this indicative or representative function in our minds, seeming to be the offspring of fact when they have only a purely

---

\* In an admirable analysis of all belief into memory and expectation, Mr. Mill traces out the various modes of these expectations. Mill's "Analysis," Editor's Note, p. 413 *et seq.*

subjective origin. Happily, in a healthy state of the mind the number and influence of these fictitious servants of experience are not large enough to affect materially our confidence in the general trustworthy character of the messengers. Yet they constitute a dark and confusing border to our intellectual life, and it is nearly always a matter of high self-discipline even to a well-trained mind to distinguish these counterfeits and to withhold from them every measure of confidence.

The precise manner in which these semblances of experience come to delude us is very difficult to determine. Frequently, in abnormal states of the mind, an emotional influence attends them, and gives them an intensity which approximately assimilates them to present realities. Yet this is by no means the whole explanation, for minds of considerable culture, and in perfectly healthy conditions have entertained these beliefs not in moments of excitement merely, but as constant convictions. Light may be thrown, we think, on this curious mental process by attending to those forms of belief begotten of experience, which most nearly resemble the pseudo-empirical beliefs.

We have seen that in the disciplined mind all legitimate belief is consciously referred to some past individual experience as its ultimate basis. Nor is the belief of such a mind distinct and abiding unless the relations of this past experience to the present are faintly at least apprehended. Yet this is, after all, only a conception of an ideal mind. In our actual mental life we continually predict things the exact grounds of which in memory we should find it hard to specify. Not only so, but we believe things as past realities without being able even approximately to assign the time or order of the events. For example, I feel perfectly certain that I read "*Robinson Crusoe*" when I was a boy, and yet I cannot in the least recollect the attendant circumstances. Here the idea has lost its processes, so to speak, it no longer adjusts itself to other elements of my mind, and yet I accept it as the relic of an actual experience. Now a large part of our subjective beliefs present themselves to us precisely in this way. We have a distinct present idea, and believe that it stands for some past fact, though we are unable to specify its mode of origin. Here then the actual and fictitious, the subjective and objective products of the mind have a meeting point or common area in which they easily mingle, and are no longer distinguishable. Everybody may at once recall instances of these quasi-recollections, ideas which are left behind by dreams or moments of excited imagination, and come to appear as the descendants of objective impressions. We do not, of course, distinctly conceive the time and circumstances of the imaginary impression; we simply have a vague feeling of something past

to which the present idea points back. The feeling may be nothing more than a sense of familiarity, a dim consciousness of resemblance between the present conception and something gone before, and yet, by force of this confirmed habit of referring all our ideas to definite past experiences, we strive to find a proper niche for the idea in the structure of our past life. Similarly, when two ideas have somehow or other become closely connected in our minds, though their corresponding impressions may have no real objective connexion, there is a tendency in unreflective minds to accept this ideal combination as the relic of experience. They have a vague feeling of some connexion previously experienced, though this connexion was due simply to some mental process at the time, as the vague feeling of an analogy.

The case of unfounded anticipations is susceptible of a very similar explanation. Although an exceptionally cautious person uniformly examines the grounds of his expectations in past experience, most people fall into the habit of anticipating many things automatically, so to speak, that is, without conscious reflection why they do so. This rough practice, which as we have seen is the instinctive impulse of the primitive mind, serves very well for a few obviously invariable phenomena, as the recurring phases of the day or year, but it easily leads to delusive belief. In this way possibilities in the future dwell on in day-dreams, or painted in lively colours for us by enthusiastic friends, recur to our minds when free from all emotional excitement, as vague unaccountable anticipations. In this manner too all the purely *mental* combinations among our ideas due to the play of the mind's feeling of resemblance, the quaint fancy of the childish intellect or the force of feeling, tend to return as expectations. When the present impression calls up the idea of another experience accidentally associated with it, this idea easily assumes the appearance of a near and coming reality. It is to be noted that these beliefs have a more or less clear reference to the future; we feel we shall one day experience the reality, though it is often hard for us to specify the approximate period of life in which this attainment will fall.

In this way we conceive it may be possible to connect our delusive forms of recollection and anticipation with what we may call the normal action of the intellect. We may regard them as exaggerations, or, better still, aberrations of the primitive impulse, modified by habit, to refer every present idea to some real object or event past or future.

Yet it may well seem doubtful whether this supposition exhausts the whole operation of ideas on belief. More particularly there remains apparently to be explained the tendency to

give to some ideas a vague form of objective existence scarcely determined in time at all. A signal instance of this process is to be found in the external projection of general ideas of which we shall speak by and by. And every vague assurance of the highly imaginative mind that its ideal groupings of idea must find somewhere in the vast universe an objective counterpart illustrates the same mental process. Some writers in order to account for this process assume an invariable tendency in the idea to simulate the appearance of a sensation, though in normal states of the mind this is at once counteracted by attendant corrective marks.\* This we think is an over-strained supposition, and is indeed, as Mr. Mill says, at once disproved by the reflection that if there were no radical intrinsic difference between a sensation and an idea, we could never attach distinctive associates to the one or to the other. Another way of viewing this tendency to objectify the spontaneous ideas of our minds is to assume a universal tendency in ideas to excite belief in their reality apart from the influence of emotion, and apart from the action of those intellectual processes of memory and anticipation which we have already described. This theory has recently been argued with considerable ingenuity by Mr. Bagehot,† who finds all ideas ready to pass into belief according to the degree of their clearness, intensity, constancy, and interest-iness. He holds that young children have "an omnivorous acquiescence in all states of consciousness," and believe in any imaginative scene, anyhow suggested to them, quite as readily as in memory. We think a part of this theory decidedly open to criticism. A child's imaginations are not, we conceive, so irrational as they at first sight appear. Its wildest conceptions, so far as their intellectual character is concerned, appear still to follow the uniform mental procedure which we have described, instinctive anticipation ever tending to base itself on memory. If you ask a child *why* it believes this and that, it understands your question, and refers back to some statement of a book or nurse's affirmation. And in doing so it distinctly proclaims its expectation to be an inference, rough enough no doubt, from the past to the future, for long before this it must be supposed to have acquired with a knowledge of the meaning of words an experience of the general sequence of events upon their prediction, that is to say, an experience of the general trustworthiness of testimony. The only other tendency observable in the child's belief besides this intellectual movement to and fro from the past to the future is the emotional effect of all exciting

---

\* For example, M. Taine, "De l'Intelligence," vol. i. book ii., "Les Images."

† *Contemporary Review*, April, 1871.

ideas, there being in this excitement, as will be shown by and by, a force that tends to obliterate the distinction between idea and reality. This force is indeed involved in Mr. Bagehot's two conditions, intensity and interestingness of the idea.

We fail then to find in the proper intellectual aspect of belief anything but the primitive tendency to project our ideas into the past and future greatly modified in form by subsequent multiplication of experiences, and unduly extended to ideas and connexions of ideas, the true origin and history of which we have lost. The cases of mere vague projection of our subjectively shaped ideas into the sphere of objective existence appear to us to constitute no new mental process. The ideas are present and distinct, their parentage obscured, and by a universal habit of mind we give them an objective source. The Platonists always viewed these objective ideas as somehow fairly perceivable even on earth, though not to the organs of sense; that is to say, they had an origin assigned them analogous to that of our particular ideas in past experience. Further, the vague belief in the existence of these and all other ideas is nothing but an obscured form of complex anticipation. As Berkeley long ago established, to conceive the existence of a thing is to conceive of ourselves or somebody else having an impression of it; that is to say, to have an anticipation consequent upon a momentary supposition. And indeed we find those who held to the objective reality of general ideas spoke of them as fully perceivable in an after state, or as ever cognisable to the souls of the gods. In a similar way one would find, we think, that all our vaguest conjectures of objective existence in reveries and moments of exalted imagination are capable of being brought under the same intellectual processes.

With respect to the various modes in which our subjective ideas and their combinations arise in the mind, little can be said here. These processes can only be fully studied in the full exposition of our intellectual life. One or two of the more important peculiarities of our intellectual mechanism are all that we can refer to. Of these the first is the fusion of ideas which invariably occur in certain connexion into one apparently simple idea. The bond of this connexion may be contiguity or nearness in time between the corresponding impressions, or the mental bond supplied by a feeling of their resemblance. A signal instance of the first kind of inseparable association is to be found, according to the view of Mr. Mill and other Idealists, in our supposed intuitions of external objects, the quasi independent object having never in fact been experienced, and its idea being nothing but the mental residuum of that aggregate of impressions which we have uniformly experienced together

under given circumstances. Examples of similar impressions blending to constitute apparently new types of ideas are to be found in all our abstractions. According to the Nominalist theory these ideas are nothing but closely united aggregates of like particular ideas, with their similar feature or features accented by the general name, which at the same time binds them together. Yet they easily come to appear as heterogeneous elements underivable from single impressions. And agreeably to this we frequently find a tendency in the human mind to give them in some form or another an independent position in the objective universe. Not only did the extravagant assumption of the Platonic Realists spring from this tendency, but all the modern assumptions of an underlying power or force supposed to be necessitated by every series of like phenomena are in reality the workings of an impulse to invest a general idea with some kind of objective validity. No doubt other tendencies also co-operate to support these assumptions. Thus our notions of external force may all be traced to hasty extensions of the crude induction that our own movements are preceded by exertion of conscious energy. But the chief force at work is the desire to find an objective support for a subjective idea. And this impulse involves in the case of general ideas not only an intellectual but also an emotional process, of which we shall have to speak further on. Even general ideas of mental phenomena themselves may give rise to analogous beliefs. When we ascribe to our series of like volitional or ethical states a certain underlying power—namely, the will or conscience, the process is still the reflex movement of a general idea towards objective reality; for we always conceive such secret powers of the mind as somehow observable, and forming proper objects of consciousness to an adequate intelligence.

It will be seen then that the ancient yet still partially surviving notions of substance, being, substratum of powers or properties, and so on, imply both the fusion of closely bound ideas of contiguous impressions, and the blending of the products of a long series of like impressions into a general idea. To this it should be added the decay, through inattention, of certain portions of the original idea. That this intellectual process is to be found in our acceptance of general ideas as elementary growths, follows at once from the Nominalist view. According to this theory every general idea is nothing but a rapid series of particular ideas with individual varieties of character, and yet we are never aware of this except upon close reflection and exact analysis. With respect to contiguously linked ideas the influence of this decay does not at first sight appear. Yet in the case of a simple material object our supposition that the



congeries of impressions actual and possible, is one indivisible existence, really springs, on the Idealist's hypothesis, from our inattention to the intermediate links which hold these various impressions together. So far from the colour, form and taste of an orange being mysteriously united in one common point, we require to interpose a large number of movements in order to pass from one to the other. But these movements are a constant element in all perception, residing not in the accidental circumstances of the moment but in ourselves. Hence we do not need to attend to them, and in consequence of this the various impressions held together by them fall into one seemingly continuous whole. It might be further shown that our apparent intuitions of the relations of space, such as distance, position, &c., all involve the dropping out of sight of certain constant elements in our own movements upon which, and only then, the proper experiences which seem such instantaneous intuitions are attainable.

In these ways, then, ideas which properly originated in experience come by the mere play of this coming and going in consciousness to lose their resemblance to experience, and to give shape to slightly delusive belief. The other intellectual processes by which ideas, and consequently beliefs, tend to deviate from experience, may for the most part be summed up as the work of imagination or the constructive part of the mind, the linking together of simple ideas of experience in new combinations in obedience to the influence of some feeling. Imagination in this sense would include the crude superstitions of the savage quite as much as the refined conceptions of a modern poet. The full discussion of these processes falls, of course, under the head of the influence of feeling on belief. Only a remark or two need be given on the intellectual movements concerned. The very simplest mode of this independent flight of the mind may be found, perhaps, in the vulgar habit of selecting as types of Nature's processes only instances of phenomena that strike the imagination and infuse wonder. Mr. Mill has called attention to this mental source of error in discussing the subject of logical fallacies. Under the same head, too, we may refer most of the crude beliefs of the uncivilized in magic, omens, and their quasi-scientific developments, augury, oneiromancy, astrology, &c. All such beliefs illustrate not so much the effect of limited and accidental experience and association, as the selective and constructive power of the mind under the impulses of such feelings as wonder, terror, and a general inclination to wish for happy events. Where these feelings are powerfully developed, as they invariably are among primitive peoples, belief far outruns experience. Every faint

analogy is seized and transformed into a mysterious symbol. Circumstances having nothing in common but proximity in time are invested with all kinds of miraculous relations to one another.\* Also in the pleasing imaginations of cultivated minds a finer intellectual activity of the same kind may be found. More especially by the imaginative isolation of certain ideas, as in all abstractions of perfectly pure qualities, by the extensive multiplication of simple ideas, as in all conceptions of the infinite in space and time, and by endless recombinations of various elements in harmonious wholes—by these and like processes, all limited as they are by certain broad conditions of experience, the various higher emotions are enabled to erect airy worlds for themselves wherein they may wander free and unrestrained.

But enough has been said probably respecting the intellectual conditions of belief, which though perhaps the most conspicuous are by no means the sole agencies determining its character. As the conclusion of this part of our examination we may say that belief attends in an inexplicable manner all ideal relics of our experience, and in normal states of the mind may be looked on as the instinctive self-adaptation of the mind to its external surroundings. Yet this tendency is frequently counteracted by other influences even in the region of intellect itself, except where high logical culture is found. We have now to pass to regions of the mind where we shall find this simple mathematical expression of the law of belief still more widely and seriously contradicted, and reduced to the position of a mere probability valid only within a very limited sphere of our mental life.

The powerful influence of feeling in belief has long been recognised. Indeed we think most persons would be inclined at first sight to call belief nothing but a particular feeling. It certainly seems far more an emotion than an act of the intellect; and, yet it is so unique a phase of the mind that we must place it apart from the emotions just as we have distinguished it from activity.† Whether or no some amount of feeling proper is not present in every belief is another question and may perhaps, upon

---

\* For an excellent account and a truly scientific explanation of these mental phenomena, see the interesting work of Mr. Tylor, already referred to, "Primitive Culture," vol. i. chap. iv.

† Mr. Bagehot, for example, in the essay spoken of, distinctly regards all belief as emotional in character. Belief has, no doubt, many analogies with feeling in general. First of all, apart from its subject-matter it is of the nature of mental elation, whereas doubt, its opposite condition, is discordant and wearing. Then it tends, as Mr. Bagehot very clearly shows, to return to the mind just like any associated feeling, even when its logical grounds have again and again been destroyed. Still, we think its differences are yet greater than its resemblances, and would serve to make its treatment under the genus

an exhaustive analysis of the conditions of belief, be answered in the affirmative. Be this so or not, most persons will admit that feeling very often gives rise or at least an extra support to our convictions. Everybody, we suspect, entertains in some faint measure at least certain beliefs which are known to have no ground in experience, but which are pleasing and afford a certain solace to the mind. Even the trained logical mind is aware of a tendency in this direction, though he may seek to check it. In many persons destitute of such logical training these grateful beliefs form a very considerable element of happiness, in some cases ministering a daily satisfaction of a very intense kind. According to the several modes and degrees of this tendency as contrasted with the power of experience we have all the varieties of the believing mind, the generally credulous, the stubborn and incontrovertible, the hopeful and optimistic, the sceptical and cynical.

In order to understand the effect of emotion on belief it may not be out of place to remember that our emotions are very much the same in character, whether excited by a sensation or an idea. While every idea is somehow or other *qualitatively* unlike a sensation, any colouring of feeling attending it is only *quantitatively* different from the corresponding phase of the sensation. Thus the pleasurable aspect of brilliant light or graceful form is scarcely distinguishable except in degree from the grateful feeling which accompanies the mental pictures of these impressions, and everybody recognises in the uncomfortable feeling which a talk about tooth-drawing awakens, a certain faint measure of precisely the same quality of pain that the active operation produces. So far as the idea of the sensation is recoverable at all, its pleasurable or painful concomitant is exactly reproduced. And if this is true of the simple feelings attending a sensation, it is still more true of those composite feelings accompanying a sensation and a group of adhering ideas, that is to say, our emotions. The pain of an actually perceived insult is scarcely distinguishable from the pain of a suspected or distinctly conceived insult; and the aroma of pleasure that breathes from a spring landscape comes scarcely less sweet through the ideal channels of a poet's verse. We thus find in all feeling as such and as contrasted with perception, thought and all that is included in intellect, a great obstructive force in the way of clear discrimination of idea and sensation, assumption and fact, which

of emotions exceedingly confusing. The mode of its origin, the impartial range of its objects, and the fact that it holds common relations to all the emotions properly so called, renders it very undesirable to classify them together.

when the emotional colouring of an idea is strong, easily tends to counteract the intellectual processes and to confuse the mind.

But leaving this fundamental peculiarity of emotion itself we may best of all trace its influence on belief by considering its relations to our ideas and intellectual processes. The first thing to be remarked here is that whenever an emotion attaches to itself distinct ideas, they tend to become very intense, to brighten, so to speak, in the glow of the emotional surroundings, and to attain a persistency and a vivacity which assimilate them more or less completely to external sensations. Though we have assumed what we think is a self-evident distinction between the sensation and the idea in ordinary states of mind, nobody can help seeing that the idea has a marked resemblance to the sensation, and shades away from its original in very fine gradations. Now the effect of any emotional agitation is to give such a glow of intensity and such a stubborn persistence to the idea it may call up in the mind as to almost obliterate its distinctive marks. The full effect of this process is to be found in certain diseased states of the mind of which M. Taine gives a very interesting account. But all strong excitement has a tendency in this direction, and so has a marked disturbing effect on the normal intellectual course of belief. When the emotional excitement is not strong enough for this, it still intensifies the present ideas and predisposes the mind to believe in the immediate proximity of the facts, in other words to favour the strongest form of anticipation. Illustrations of these influences are abundantly supplied by Professor Bain. In very early life the effect of an emotional element in an idea is very conspicuous. Ideas of a pleasurable and painful character seem indeed in the dawning mind to be the only objects of belief. All uninteresting impressions, the multitude of sights and sounds that reach the child's consciousness, appear scarcely to leave an after-trace; and it is probably a long and slow process by which the mind comes to observe, remember, and predict all the more indifferent daily facts of life. In addition to pleasure and pain, any form of neutral emotional excitement exercises the same influence: all the circumstances that make impressions striking and wonderful, such as their novelty, unexpectedness or magnitude, produce a certain current of emotional excitement that forms a vortex, so to speak, about the remaining idea, and serves to force it into consciousness with greater impetus.

Detailed illustrations of the various kinds of emotional excitement as affecting belief will not be expected here. They would fall more properly under a general treatment of the emotions; and indeed Mr. Bain systematically discusses these effects of any feeling along with the particular feeling itself. Only one case requires to be rather fully noticed here because of its close rela-

tion to prevailing theories of belief. We refer to the effect of the spontaneous impulses of activity which are undoubtedly a part of our mental constitution. Mr. Bain, as we have seen, seeks to make this the primitive root of belief. We have felt ourselves compelled to differ from this view, and it now remains for us to state what influence we conceive activity is fitted to exercise on our believing power.

That it has an influence on belief, nobody can well doubt who reflects on their intimate connexion. All consciously directed action must, it is obvious, proceed on belief—namely, the assurance of some good to be attained or evil to be averted. Voluntary action thus always implies a belief in our own powers, and requires this belief as its initial condition. Now action is by no means an indifferent state of the mind. It has its own pleasurable consciousness, which is commonly spoken of as a feeling of energy and power, love of adventure, and so on. Mr. Bain has traced a considerable part of this pleasure to an instinctive spontaneity which predisposes to action, and finds a satisfying vent in it. In such primitive impulses we have a powerful mode of excitement attending all our earliest exertions. By a simple process of association this excitement clings to all ideas of a practical character. That is to say, if you present to a boy's mind the probability of his seeing some show at the cost of a good run, or of preventing some trick of his rival by dint of considerable painstaking, there will be a tendency, through the action of an ideal revival of the active excitement, to abbreviate the proper estimation of the chances of success, and to magnify the range of one's own powers. The process seems precisely analogous to any other mode of emotional excitement. During the proposal the boy's mind would naturally turn from an idea of success to that of failure, the idea which had most evidence in its favour winning control. But instead of this there intervenes a disturbing excitement, the ideal stimulation of active consciousness, which helps to intensify and to retain the idea of success and all its indications, while it similarly seeks to exclude all ideas of failure.

So far we have illustrated only the mode in which active excitement supports a belief in the efficacy of one's own will. But its influence extends further than this, into the sphere of uncontrollable nature. If, for example, the idea of a long ramble or an afternoon's skating has been presented to a boy's mind, the excitement of anticipated action (apart from the ideas of the attendant pleasures) will predispose him to hopeful views of the weather, state of the roads, and so on. In other words, he will be inclined to look only on the chances of favouring circumstances, happy events, and to lose sight of all possibilities of an adverse character.

In this way we think by the play of our active forces and the excitement accompanying it we are inclined to look at the bright side of life and to believe in an ever-friendly nature. The full effects of health and vigour of mental tone in general on our beliefs will be spoken of presently. We have referred in this place to the co-operation of spontaneity in order to show that this mental force, so far from being the exclusive source of belief, disposes the mind to certain forms of belief. As we have already said, the firm belief of a child in the painful property of fire, so far from springing from activity, arises in direct opposition to its influence. If activity were the sole well-spring of confidence we should entertain none but extravagant views of our own abilities and absurdly false notions of the order of external nature. Happily, however, experience is just as much a direct source of belief as our activity, and tends to keep the impulses of the latter within due limits.

We imagine, then, that in spite of the close connexion in our mental processes between belief and action, the direct influences of the latter on the former do not present a unique phenomenon, but are precisely similar to the effects of all other modes of mental excitement. The force of spontaneity, which constitutes the chief element in this excitement of action, is undoubtedly a peculiar phenomenon, scarcely to be classified with the emotions; yet the tone of mental excitement accompanying it is scarcely distinguishable from proper emotional agitation, and, so far as its effect on ideas and, through them, on beliefs is concerned, follows the same psychological law.

The foregoing examples may suffice to illustrate the operation of emotional excitement viewed as present in the mind as an inseparable concomitant of an idea. Other aspects of this influence of emotion on belief are to be found in the degree of vitality and the range of influence of any feeling when excited, and further in the readiness of any feeling to recur in the mind. The first of these circumstances illustrates the principle of emotional self-conservation. Any emotion when excited in consciousness tends, with a force proportionate to its intensity, to sustain itself, and so to exclude certain opposed states of feeling incompatible with it, and, in consequence of this, to banish from the mind all ideas associated with those discordant states. Consequently, during the reign of any strong emotional excitement the mind has a strong predisposition to remember and to anticipate a certain variety of facts. Familiar illustrations of this principle will at once occur to the reader. In an angry fit not only are all ideas of deliberate wrong called up and rendered intense and persistent, but the proper sources of idea in our intellectual workings are disturbed, so that a suggestion of

the supposed offender being unconscious of the effect of his action, or any other considerations that would restrain the feeling, are effectively barred out, while any thoughts fitted to awaken an opposite or discordant feeling—such as love or admiration towards the offender—have not the slightest chance of engaging attention. The most universal effect of such a dominant feeling in the selection of ideas is to be found in its craving for some cause or ground of its existence. Every fit of terror, every flow of æsthetic pleasure, seeks some distinct objective source of its existence, some *raison d'être* for itself. This apparent rationality of feeling is after all more an emotional, than an intellectual process. It is the impulse of the ruling excitement to augment itself partly by new inflammatory suggestions or ideas, partly by the desire for others to participate in it and sustain it by their sympathy. The whole working of this principle of emotional tyranny, as it may be called, in respect to the forces of the intellect, has been illustrated by Mr. Bain with his customary fullness and clearness; and we shall need only to trace out a few of its most curious bearings on the phenomena of belief. The transient and momentary beliefs which a single sudden feeling serves to support do not need to be further noticed here. Everybody is aware an instant or two after the exciting fit how absurd were the ideas and confidences it gave rise to. The sudden images which a brief attack of terror or anger gives birth to appear afterwards like creations of a madman; and happily in the case of most people the correctives of such disturbing passion are nearly as swift-footed as the disease itself. Such accidental and irregular effects on belief, as they have scarcely an appreciable effect on the individual's customary convictions, hardly need to be dwelt upon by the psychologist. It is not till we have a more or less persistent state of mind favourable to a given kind of feeling that the effect of emotion on belief becomes important. As an example of this we may take the long series of gloomy forebodings which certain depressed states of health predispose the mind to entertain. If we knew the average affinity or attraction of a mind for a given type of feeling, and the chief general circumstances of life fitted to raise or depress the degree of this attraction, we should be able to specify the amount of influence it is likely to have on the individual's belief. Whenever a mode of feeling is easily excited, and appears frequently in great intensity, its action on belief is of course likely to be great. Consequently the chief interest of our present inquiry centres about what some psychologists distinguish as affections or habits of feeling as contrasted with single emotional states. All such recurrences of feeling illustrate not only the effect of past experiences, but

also the natural bent of the mind to any species of feeling. This bent is very different in different persons, and is the result not so much of emotional culture as of natural temperament and physical constitution.

The simplest illustration of a predisposition to a certain variety of feeling is to be found in the hopeful and happy, as contrasted with the gloomy and timid mind. While everybody is aware of alternations of these states during brief intervals and long periods of life, some persons manifest a constant bent to one or the other mode of feeling. We have already spoken of the effects of a full supply of active energy and robust health as a foundation of the hopeful temper. In addition to this we think the general emotional cast of a mind may be peculiarly receptive and retentive of ideas of pleasure or of their opposites. That is to say, in certain types of mind, and in certain states of an individual mind, there is a special attraction for ideas of a pleasurable or for those of a painful character, so that we find all suggestions of the one class eagerly seized and retained in consciousness, while those of the opposite order are fugitive and unimpressive. The gay and buoyant nature takes to all ideas of good as its natural aliment, and laughs off all forebodings of evil, while the gloomy spirit grasps every new possibility of evil, and throws its murky shadow over every winged messenger of joy that flits across its borders. Such phenomena may justly be regarded as a proper illustration of the power of a ruling feeling. For in both these cases we see that there is a prevailing tone of mind, an average degree of cheerfulness, partly the result of experience, but largely the effect of natural temperament, with which all welcomed suggestions harmonize, all rejected ones are discordant. Such differences of temperament do not vary exactly as the degree of health, for we find some weakly persons singularly serene and buoyant. The physical foundation of this natural temper is to be sought, we think, partly, as we have shown, in the amount of muscular energy, partly in the general abundance or deficiency of nervous energy, which, along with the rising or falling of activity, constitutes the mental side of robust or feeble health, and finally, perhaps, in some qualitative peculiarity of the energy so supplied.

It would be possible, one thinks, to give this effect of prevailing tone a wider illustration throughout the whole region of our emotional life. For any given emotion is not the mere effect of past individual experiences called up by association, not precisely the algebraical sum of all the pleasures and pains previously experienced in a certain connexion. We find similar experiences give rise to very different degrees of the same emotion, and the psychologist has to assume in consequence a certain natural



emotional bent always predisposing the mind to entertain ideas of a certain order. The influence of such a permanent natural disposition on the individual's habitual belief is a very familiar fact to all careful students of human character. It may frequently be traced back to a physical basis closely connected with the vigour of the organism, and in this way it is scarcely distinguishable from the general effect of health and mental-tone already described. Thus, for example, the poetic and ideal expectations of youth are closely related to the general tone of mental buoyancy and its predilection for all pleasurable ideas. Loss of this elasticity through weakened health, or, as more frequently happens, the harsh correction of experience, frequently tames down these soaring expectations, and the middle-aged man looks back on the romantic confidence of youth, and says with Schiller—

“ Erlöschen sind die heitern Sonnen  
Die meiner Jugend Pfad erhellt;  
Die Ideale sind zerronnen,  
Die einst das trunkne Herz geschwellt;  
Er ist dahin, der süsse Glaube  
An Wesen, die mein Traum gebar,  
Der rauhen Wirklichkeit zum Raube,  
Was einst so schön, so göttlich war.”

Yet even at this unromantic stage of life most people seek to indulge belief in some distant vaguely-conceived ideal of beauty and quiet happiness. The religious mind finds a resting-place untouched by the floods of experience in the unseen world and the mystery of an after-life. The metaphysical mind seeks a safe harbour for its æsthetic aspirations in vague and unverifiable theories of an Absolute Being free from all the limitations of our finite cognition, or in the doctrine of eternal ideas, preserving in the most stable objective form all the evanescent conceptions of the good and beautiful so rarely attainable by our faltering minds. In these and a multitude of other cases, which we may leave the reader's memory to supply, we may still discern the instinctive impulse of the happy, hopeful mind, restrained within very narrow limits it is true, but still surviving and ruling within these limits with undivided supremacy.

One instance, however, of this bent of natural temperament is so important in relation to our subject, that we must briefly refer to it. We mean the characteristic inclination of a mind towards independence of belief or repose in authority. It wants but little reflection on human nature to see that this antithesis forms a great line of demarcation in the grouping of characters. The mind, strong in self-assertion, eager to try its own rash sug-

gestions, impatient of all control in action as in thought, too little considerate for the feelings and claims of others, is a familiar variety of human character, and stands in sharp contrast to the less vigorous soul, timid, dependent and reverential towards others, and ever ready to accept their dicta in place of the suggestions of its own experience or reason. Here again we may trace the effect of natural activity and vigorous health. For self-assertion is the growth of abundant spontaneity which loves free scope of action, and always believes in its own prowess; whereas a timid clinging to others arises from a want of strong initial impulse to action in the individual's own mind. The difference between the two sexes in this direction of confidence is largely due, we suspect, to such physical peculiarities. The attitude of dependence for guidance and protection which women have been so long accustomed to maintain is no doubt to a large extent an artificial growth, and may be dissolved by an opposite mode of education; yet so long as society retains its insecurities, and makes claim on the individual's powers of self-defence, the less robust physique of the woman may be expected to maintain a considerable degree of that self-distrust so favourable to the conservative tendency in belief. Besides the difference in bodily vigour, other peculiarities of emotional temperament enter into this propensity. Along with less robust activity there frequently co-operates in the reverential type of mind an abundance of passive feeling, more especially tenderness in all its forms of love and admiration; and these emotions obviously favour extreme trust in one's fellow-creatures. Such a cast of mind is naturally predisposed to repose in the veracity of others. Every assertion made by the persons who are the objects of these feelings has a kind of aroma about it which at once harmonizes with the prevailing tone of respectful affectionateness, and close individual inquiry and exercise of independent judgment are excluded by the quiet but persistent flow of this emotional current. Besides the circle of an individual's intimate friends and acquaintances, this impulse of reliance extends to many unknown except by perusal of their writings or report of their deeds. A feeling of tender attachment grows up in the cultivated man for his favourite poet or philosopher, and every new utterance from this source is at once supported by all the force of this pre-existing respect. An interesting form of this emotion mingling with that instinctive reverence for the vague and unknown to which we have already alluded is to be found in men's worship of the past, and in the unbounded degree of reliance which we accord to a name reverend through its antiquity. The student of human evolution may find here a relic of that complete sway over action and creed which in primitive stages of society was

exercised by the elders.\* In the modern veneration for ancient authority the element of dread is well-nigh lost in the overgrowth of an affectionate respect, yet looked at as a historical growth it is probably nothing but a gradual transformation of this primitive submission to age. The vague mist in which the remoteness of antiquity surrounds its revered names, and the difficulty of directly applying the test of verification to many of their utterances, are highly favourable to the selection of these ancient authorities as secure ground of an unbounded trust, even after confidence in one's contemporaries has been considerably shaken. In the domain of psychological theory the effect of this sentiment for the antique may be traced, we think, in all assumptions of innate powers and *à priori* forms of thought. The remoteness of these imaginary existences, and the fact of their priority to all our experiences have served to clothe them in a unique and mysterious dignity, while religious ideas and ascetic tendencies to disparage sensations have co-operated to sustain the beliefs.

The case of the independent thinker illustrates just the converse emotional influences. Strong activity is itself a considerable check on the emotional tendencies of the mind, and we rarely find a very energetic mind naturally predisposed to the softer varieties of feeling. On the other hand, there grow up out of a robust activity itself a new order of feelings which combine with it in supporting self-reliance. Such active forms of emotion are to be found in the sentiment of power, the love of liberty, the love of antagonism, and the curious complex feeling of pride or self-respect. A mind of this stamp is naturally predisposed to boldness of thought as well as of action, and it often needs a very slow and painful discipline to check the undue growth of this propensity and to temper the pride of conscious strength by an infusion of sympathy and respect for others. Such a nature too is prone to set aside the recollection of its own delusions, and to shut its eyes to the proper logical claims of others' experiences. When this robust and self-assertive mind has been properly trained, both in the manifestation of moral feelings and in the calm consideration of evidence, it becomes, as Mr. Mill says, the finest material for high character and clear intellect; yet the attainment of this happy mean is by no means an easy process.

---

\* Mr. Tylor, in his elaborate work on "Primitive Culture," p. 36, suggests that the belief in antiquity results from an intellectual process. By a confusion of thought, he thinks, we ascribe to men of old the wisdom of old men. This is very likely a co-operating cause, especially among simple people, but the emotional source seems to us the more important.

Very closely analogous to this contrast between the independent and reverent type of believing mind, is that of the scientific or investigating, and the wondering mind. While, as we shall presently see, the pursuit of science and the explanation of phenomena by assimilating them under like aspects has its own form of emotional stimulus, this is a very feeble form of excitement as compared with the outgoings of surprise and wonder. The craving for the mysterious, the striking and the exceptional, is an important factor in the emotional type of mind as distinguished from the intellectual and volitional; and accordingly we find emotional temperaments generally strongly inclined to believe in the miraculous, to isolate particular facts instead of comparing them, and to seek objects of wonder in all the accidental coincidences of life. Combined as it very frequently is in rich emotional natures with tenderness and dependence, it tends to make antiquity a supreme object of admiring wonder; and constitutes a powerful predisposition to religious belief. It finds its fullest vent in early stages of development, both of the individual and of the race, when intelligence is scarcely dawning, and extensive action has not familiarized the mind with objects. Yet even after considerable intellectual culture it remains a characteristic propensity of the warmer temperament, fixing itself on the remote in space and time, and exalting everything within these regions to an ideal magnitude. The scientific mind, on the other hand, is characterized not only by a lively feeling for the similarity of things, but by comparative weakness of the emotional forces, and also by the fullness of active energy which seems a universal antagonist to emotion. Hence we commonly find that the children and men who show a strong eagerness for examination and research are full of action. For not only is all research a form of muscular activity often very intense, as, for example, in microscopic investigations, and so presupposes a love of action as an initial impulse, but action has to proceed on belief in uniformity in some shape, and consequently the wider our range of action the more we distinctly realize these uniformities. Where this fullness of active energy is accompanied by keen intellect we have all the conditions of the curious, exploring, and truth-seeking mind.

We will conclude our illustration of the emotional sources of belief by a consideration of one or two forms of sentiment which in all cultivated minds exercise an habitual sway, and are closely connected with the proper intellectual pursuit of truth. They are not like many of our more elementary feelings, mere disturbances of the strict logical processes of the mind, but are the outgrowth and frequently the auxiliary of a pure quest of truth. Yet some forms of them, like all other feelings, tend to

break asunder from their roots, and to form independent centres of belief, while others remain true to their ancillary function. They constitute permanent wants, so to speak, in the believing mind of most cultivated persons, and form along with the proper logical faculty a kind of examining board, accepting as worthy of belief only those ideas which satisfy its requirements.

The first of these feelings is a group partly intellectual, partly æsthetic, and in consequence not perfectly subordinate to the logical function. It includes such emotions as a love of simplicity, a desire for symmetry, a feeling for unity, and similar shades of sentiment. In part these feelings grow up, as we have said, out of strictly logical processes. The first impulses of the scientific mind were in the direction of a rude and tentative comparison of phenomena, and a discovery of some simple uniformity; and the whole body of our stable and verified scientific doctrines is nothing but the fruit of this same instinctive impulse trained and restricted by wider observation and closer discrimination. This impulse to assimilate our impressions, to link together the past and future, the known and the unknown, we have looked upon as an intimate fact of our nature, the starting-point of belief and action alike. It must now be added that the successful pursuit of this underlying unity in nature is the source of a very deep and refined pleasure. The naturalist indulges in a legitimate glow of self-congratulation when he has reduced a stubborn mass of mutually antagonistic facts to the calm reign of a single law. The first perception of an underlying something linking together such widely various phenomena as a falling stone and a revolving world must have brought to the heart of the great Newton a thrill of joy which a common mind can scarcely conceive; over and above the delight common to all attainment, the mere flash of intellect that reveals the hidden affinity of the widely diversified is the source of an elevated pleasure. And this feeling, like all other forms of pleasurable consciousness, tends to support the belief in the discovered unity. Much of the intensity of belief which the man of science displays in his favourite doctrines is due to the complex feelings that cluster about every new discernment of nature's uniformities. He finds a renewed gratification in tracing again and again the dominance of a discovered law. The intricate way in which he finds nature linking together, by some secret thread, the most unlike regions of phenomena excites his admiration and becomes for his mind the chief aspect of her beauty. All the shades of sentiment which are called forth by the spectacle of orderly arrangement, just balance of proportions and a uniting plan, attach themselves to his scientific principles, and invest them with new dignity and an æsthetic value quite independent of their practical importance.

Yet while these winged feelings form valuable forces, if yoked with the steady-footed logical intellect, they may easily break loose from this control and bear the mind to airy regions of belief, lacking all the stable support of evidence. Indeed, as a matter of history the independent dominion of these emotions long preceded their due subordination to logical search; and in the case of many a young explorer even now, they bear the mind in wild flight to most crude and fanciful hypotheses ere a finer discipline brings them under the control of fact and reason. The first rash attempts of the Greek physicists to discover one fundamental all-pervading form of matter, form a striking illustration of such misdirection of the love of simplification. A large measure of the confidence accorded to the metaphysical assumptions of general substances probably arose from a vague feeling of gratification at the closer unity of Nature's whole, which those substances were curiously imagined to signify. And this feeling must be regarded as an additional support to those projections of general ideas into the region of objective nature of which we have already sought to show the intellectual source in inattention to their origin. Every general idea is simply the mind's mechanism for viewing together a large and scattered mass of distinct particulars; yet the love of unity easily leads us to give them an objective validity, and to conceive of a mysterious something running through the actual phenomena and forming a bond of attachment quite apart from the conditions of our cognitive minds. The continual tendency of metaphysical writers in all times to mistake exact similarity for identity, probably involves, in addition to an error of thought, this impulse to find some objective bond of particular phenomena corresponding to our feeling of resemblance. It is very curious, as Mr. Mill has recently shown,\* that even Berkeley fell into this error by assuming that a present impression of St. Paul's Cathedral is the *same* set of sensations (or ideas in Berkeley's language) as previous impressions of this object years ago. Nor are similar tendencies of this passion for unification even now wanting. We may easily find in the region of mental and of material phenomena unverified hypotheses which are tenaciously held to for no other reason than that of their seeming to supply another thread of unity to Nature's diversities. We may just refer to the prevalent notions of mind, will, and conscience conceived as permanent substrata to the series of distinct phenomena which our assimilating intelligence views together;† or to the common talk

\* See *Fortnightly Review* for November last.

† We have sought to illustrate this tendency along with other emotional forces of belief, in the case of the will, in an article entitled, "The Genesis of the Free-will Doctrine." See *Westminster Review* for July last.

of Naturalists about permanent force, not only particular types of force, such as mechanical, electrical, holding together the respective series of phenomena which we view under these aspects, but one universal force contained in all these varieties, and uniting all the various phenomena of the material world in some mysterious liaison. It is probable that the discovery of the mutual convertibility of the various orders of phenomena thus grouped together, the celebrated doctrine of the conservation of force, has appeared to lend support to these unphilosophic ideas of a mysterious something remaining permanent throughout a long succession of similar phenomena. What we have discovered to be a mere uniformity of order and numerical relation among various phenomena has been transformed by the undue impulse of emotion to unify the diverse into a new version of an uncreated and unchanging noumenon. As a crowning example of this unifying impulse we may just refer to every hypothesis for assimilating the radically opposed regions of mental and material phenomena. One of the most curious of these attempts, and one that best of all shows the utter futility of trying to join together what nature has put asunder, is to be found, we think, in Leibnitz's postulate of an elementary monad uniting in itself the two poles of the spiritual and the material; and a similar effort has recently been made by M. Taine in the work we have already referred to. The whole field of modern German metaphysics is one grand illustration of the power of this æsthetic propensity in sustaining beliefs. Every attempt at a *Weltanschauung* which shall embrace all the known under one abstract conception, every glorification of the *Einheitsprinzip* which one so frequently comes across in modern German literature, is the outcome not of a calm scientific reflection, but of an impatience of all division in phenomena, of that emotional craving for even the semblance of unity, which, while it is so closely allied to the desire of truth, may only too easily become one of its most effective antagonists.

The other varieties of emotional influences which remain to be considered here, may be viewed as the proper concomitants of the intellectual impulses to truth. They grow up along with and out of this intellectual activity, and serve to add a greater vivacity and intensity to the beliefs accepted by the logical mind. The first of these is the emotional need of harmony, the play of which is observable in all departments of mental life, and extends to the most sober conclusions of reason. Its function here is to render all contradictory states of belief discordant and painful, and to seek and to sustain everything like just agreement among our convictions. It does not of itself supply a perfectly safe controller of our reasoning processes. For it is obvious that be-

fore the pain of a contradiction is felt, memory must recall the past inconsistent belief, and the discriminative intellect must be acute enough for the prompt recognition of their mutual contradiction; and these conditions of logical consistency are often wanting even in minds that are keenly sensitive to the pleasure and pain of intellectual harmony and conflict. More especially it may be remarked that all other varying emotional sources of belief easily counteract the influence of this feeling. When there is any present mental excitement strongly sustaining a particular form of belief there is but little chance of our remembering yesterday's contradictory belief; and hence we find the most excitable persons are most ready to entertain contradictory notions within short limits of time. In minds better controlled by intellect and will, this sentiment of harmony plays a very important part, and becomes the motive force in wide comparison of our various beliefs, so as to bring them into relations of harmony with one another. In logically cultivated persons it is the emotional counterpart of the deductive side of intellectual activity, serving to adjust every new belief to those previously accepted, whereas the feeling for unity in variety corresponds to the inductive impulse. It might indeed be objected that these two modes of feeling are at bottom but one, for the child who finds to-day's experience unlike yesterday's, receives a mental shock scarcely distinguishable from our feeling of contradiction; and a discovery of a uniformity seems to satisfy a feeling of harmony precisely similar in character to the sentiment springing out of consistency. Yet the two modes of feeling receive such a different stamp from the objects with which they have to do, and fulfil such perfectly distinct functions in our life, that we have treated them as radically separable.

The other variety of feeling springing out of our strictly scientific activity or the proper pursuit of truth, has reference to the practical value of certain knowledge. Every one can see that more than half the worth of truth to ordinary minds arises from its fitness to become the guide-post of practical life. Not only are our actions directed by our beliefs, but our daily consolations and encouragements are largely derived from anticipations of the future; and the reception of a false belief entails in consequence waste of active energy and, still worse, sharp pangs of disappointment, the sudden collapse of a cheering support, the cruel awakening to painful fact in place of sweet dream. The consequence is, that in minds strongly retentive of past painful experiences, there grows up a new regulative power in belief. The first effect is undoubtedly to check the believing propensity in general, to induce reflection, caution, and deliberateness in belief. Acting through the will as a very powerful sanction, it



retards action, intensifies the intellectual processes, and thus affords every opportunity for memory to restore past experiences, and the feeling of consistency to test the logical validity of the proposed truth. Yet this is not the whole of its operation. Besides acting as a restraint on all belief, it serves to alter the relative force of its various sources. More particularly it grows into a habitual attitude of suspicion towards mere subjective conjecture, unfounded theory, and emotional prompting to the acceptance of certain ideas; and at the same time it lends a new support to experience, exalting it into a supreme arbiter of our believing acts. For the daily lessons of life serve not only to show us the hollowness of all illogical and unverified beliefs, but to deepen more and more our sense of the value of the past when properly retained in memory and interpreted by logical reflection. Experience becomes in this way not simply the negative and restrictive force in belief, confining it within certain bounds, but also a new and distinct positive source of confidence, of a confidence qualitatively unlike the first wild random promptings of feeling and activity. The peculiar character of this trust is to be found in its clearness, tenacity, and perfect repose, and is traceable, we think, to the ever accumulative effect of our past discoveries of the trustworthiness of experience. For not only is the disappointment of expectation a pain, the realization of it is in itself, and apart from the enjoyment realized, an intense satisfaction, and the retention of these repeated satisfactions experienced in connexion with every successive confidence in experience acts like any other form of pleasurable feeling to intensify any new belief that is consciously grounded on experience. Thus there gathers about the idea of experience or fact a strong emotion of tender respect or reverent estimation, which owes part of its intensity to the positive source of its proven value, part to the negative source of the mischief arising from belief, when not thus supported by fact. As a form of emotion it is precisely similar to the warm tone of feeling which collects about any friend of whose veracity we have had frequent proof; and indeed it may best be viewed as an allowable transference of an emotion from persons to inanimate objects. Just as the discovery of the general coldness and perfidy of one's acquaintances may drive one to bestow on the tried and proven friend a far higher measure of respect and trust than his own fidelity, uncontrasted with the infidelity of the others, would have awakened, so the disillusion of the mind as to the value of its first wild aspirations and extravagant expectations brings out into full light for the first time the supreme worth of experience as the foundation of confidence.

✓ The precise mode in which this sentiment modifies the whole temper of what we may call the empirical mind is worthy of careful study. It acts not only as an emotional support, but as a volitional stimulus, and so helps to control thought and action. Its effect is to restrain not merely hasty deduction from hypothesis, but hasty induction from a few carelessly observed facts. It impels us to bring as frequently as possible every induction as well as every deduction to the test of a new experience. It provokes suspicion of distant recollection quite as much as distrust of boundless prediction; holding the directly observed fact to be the one thing worthy of trust, it seeks every opportunity of comparing new observations and experiments of oneself or of others with previously held theories. It does not attach itself simply to particular facts, but may help to sustain some of our widest generalizations, such as the law of causation. Only it bestows its support on these conclusions in virtue of the wide and various body of facts out of which they have been drawn, and of their daily reverification by every new observation and new experiment.\* It often predisposes the mind to prefer the region of Natural Science, with its clear and ready methods of observation and experiment, to Moral Science, more especially in its historical branches.† In all such cases, the intensity of the confidence that rests on experience is proportionate to the degree of proximity of the accepted theory to the ultimate basis of directly observed fact.

As already remarked, this sentiment operates both as a negative restraint and as a positive source of confidence; and each of these aspects might, if our space admitted, receive a full illustration. Of the former influence it will be sufficient to say that in the thoroughly trained positive or empirical mind no theory, no presentation of an abstract possibility, awakens a proper feeling of confidence except it bear the clear stamp of a just inference from fact. In such a mind, indeed, this sentiment tends to become the necessary condition of all belief, no force of idea or emotion being able to overpower this acquired necessity of perceiving in every doctrine tendered for acceptance a firm substratum of fact. The crowning triumph of this new sovereign

---

\* Compare the well-known remarks of Mr. Mill on the ultimate logical grounds of the Law of Causation. "System of Logic," Book III. chap. xxi. § 4.

† Professor Helmholtz offers an interesting illustration of this superior reliance on physical science in a lecture entitled, "Ueber das Verhältniss der Naturwissenschaften zur Gesamtheit der Wissenschaft." (Populäre wissenschaftliche Vorträge. Brunswick, 1865.) He ascribes the superior trustworthiness of physical science to the fact, "that in no department of knowledge can error in the thinking processes be so easily recognised as in those sciences in which we can compare, for the most part directly, the results of our thoughts with reality."

in the believing mind, may be found in the refusal to *believe* a doctrine unsupported by fact, even when compelled by the laws of association to *conceive* it. And this state of mind Mr. Mill and other Idealists profess to experience in relation to the question of an independent material world.

The positive working of this sentiment may be seen best of all in the tenacity of an empiricist's belief, even when opposed to strong emotional influences and to the promptings of interest. The calm, patient temper of mind which simply rests in fact because it is so, and refuses to loosen its hold on the garnered fruit of experience, notwithstanding the counter-attractions of mere ideal anticipation of nature, is a rare attainment, and characterizes the perfect equal development of the moral and intellectual man. It constitutes the loftiest type of a severe love of truth and a readiness to abide by it at all costs. The philosopher whose mental attitude we are now seeking to depict may feel all the sweet enticements of poetic fancy and moral longings. He too, perhaps, would fain believe in a world of beauty, in a moral order of the universe clearly demonstrative of a perfectly beneficent government, but stronger and deeper than the alluring power of such ideal speculations is the sustaining power of observed truth. To this sentiment—so modest, so morally noble, so much nearer a religion than the weak consolations of many who call it godless—every other impulse of his nature is made to bend.

The action of the will on belief need not long detain us. Just as belief is the starting-point of action, so we have seen spontaneous energy reacting on belief and upholding in consciousness all ideas favourable to its free vent. In all states known as strong desire there is added to this force the sway of a pleasurable idea, and the measure of confidence is here frequently out of all proportion to the evidence. The proper action of the will is of course restricted to action and the control of the thoughts and feelings. How far mere acting on a belief would tend to deepen it apart from the new evidence afforded by the result may be open to doubt. The deepening beliefs of the religious mind seem to support the view that merely acting on a belief may be the source of new associations of respect, and serve to ingrain the belief as an organized factor of the mind. The public confession of a faith is commonly supposed to have a reflex influence on the state of belief, and so far of course authority may coerce belief. But any such reflex effect is very insignificant; for, as Mr. Mill so well shows in his "Essay on Liberty," the belief in such formally accepted dogmas apart from individual thought and action is commonly inoperative and dead. In every educated mind, at least, the influence of the will on belief is indirect and negative. It acts, as we have already

hinted, in favouring suspension of judgment, deliberate reflection, and so on. In this way it serves to check the momentary impulses of feeling more especially by an increased impartial attention to ideas suggested at the time; and it may, as we have seen, effect a suspension of belief even when an idea is irresistibly called up by association, the sanctions of practical life tending to induce a slowness of belief perfectly analogous to tardiness in action. Yet in none of these cases does the will create belief. In the last-mentioned instance, for example, the lessons of experience, viewed as motives, merely promote hesitation in according confidence on insufficient grounds; the strong hold of the believing mind to experience is, on the other hand, we think, a proper emotional effect added to the primitive instinct we have already discussed in the first part of the essay. All that the will effects on belief is thus to curb for awhile the true originating sources, to give full opportunity for fair play among the several rival powers of intellect and emotion; at the end, however, when belief sets in, the result is not due directly to our volition, but to the stronger and more persistent force which manages to triumph over its competitors.

In conclusion we may remark that if our analysis of the conditions of belief is a correct one, it must be adequate to the explanation of those tolerably uniform stages in the development of belief observable both in the individual and in the race. That is to say, we should be competent to explain the order of the various grades of belief manifested in the course of a life by the varying circumstances of youth and manhood; and this we hope we have partly succeeded in doing in the course of our exposition. Similarly we should be able to say why the historical development of belief presents such and such regular phases, why for instance the human mind appears to pass through the three stages assigned by Auguste Comte, the theological, metaphysical, and positive. From a consideration of the ignorance of primitive man, the emotional state suitable to this condition, and the gradual emergence out of this state through the accumulative lessons of experience transmitted by tradition, and all the emotional and moral changes connected with this progress, we ought to be able to predict the general course of development which we now find human belief to have taken. Possibly some stray suggestions to be found in the course of this essay, together with a careful reflection on the points of analogy and diversity between the developments of the individual and collective man, may be sufficient to indicate to the thoughtful reader the method of applying more closely to this historical problem the general psychological principles that we have succeeded in collecting.

## ART. VI.—THE GOVERNMENT AND THE EDUCATION ACT.

1. *An Act to provide for Public Elementary Education in England and Wales.* 9th August, 1870.
2. *The National Education League Monthly Paper; Nos. 14–25, January to December, 1871.*

**A**T the general election the Nonconformists adhered to Mr. Gladstone with a fervour and a loyalty which astounded those who had not forgotten the days when Mr. Gladstone, though no longer a professed Tory, exhibited himself as a High Churchman, determined to surrender no iota of the privileges of his order. It was the Nonconformist organization in England which, fired by Mr. Gladstone's eloquent denunciations of the Irish Establishment, carried the great towns in a mass for the Liberal party; it was the Nonconformist element in Wales that fought the landed interest—there unscrupulous and accustomed to triumph—with signal success; and in Scotland it was the union of the Free Church and the United Presbyterians in the Liberal cause that swept the Tories, even out of the counties, north of the Tweed. Where would Mr. Gladstone have been now if, three years ago, the Nonconformists had—we do not say sided with his opponents, for that would have been contrary to the principles and the traditions of English Nonconformity—but had remained neutral and apathetic in the party strife? Had they withdrawn from the struggle, the chiefs of the Liberal party, the veteran Whigs, and the whole army of officials would have found themselves worsted, ostracised from place, condemned to exile from the pleasant retreats of the Treasury Bench for an indefinite term. Mr. Disraeli would have found it to his account to satisfy by half-measures, if not by whole measures, the demands of the people; and the Liberal party might have been excluded from power for years to come.

The loyalty of the Nonconformists to Mr. Gladstone prevented these disasters—for we believe it to be a misfortune, a degradation of public morals, when measures have to be wrung from a reluctant party instead of being conceded according to the convictions of those in power. But the Nonconformists expected naturally enough that, now at least, their opinions would count for something in the councils of Liberalism. There were two members of the Cabinet whom they regarded as especially representing their views, Mr. Bright and Mr. Forster. Unfortunately, before the work of the session of 1870 commenced, dangerous illness compelled the ablest and most trusted political leader

that English Nonconformity has ever owned to retire from public life. Mr. Forster was left, and had the charge of the measure towards which the Dissenters looked with the most jealous solicitude. He was to introduce the measure of National Education which the country after much doubt and hesitation had determined to demand. Born and bred a Nonconformist, and brought into Parliament as a Radical politician, Mr. Forster—though in his later years he had attached himself to the Established Church—might have been supposed the fittest member of the Ministry to guard the civil rights and conscientious convictions of the Nonconformists against the aggression of Churchmen.

The point of view from which the *Westminster Review* has heretofore faced the problem of National Education has been altered in some essential particulars by the adoption of the Education Act. The *Review* has consistently protested that it is unwise for the State to interfere with the education of the people, and that it is unfair to tax the community for the purpose of establishing a system of instruction under Governmental control. But Parliament, and no doubt the majority of the present electorate, have decided that it is wise and fair to do these things. We must therefore accept the situation, and labour to work the scheme adopted by Parliament so as to make it as little injurious and inequitable as may be. Granted a national system of education supervised by the State, and supported wholly or in greater part out of local or general taxation, the programme of the National Education League appears open to little exception. The League represents advanced liberal opinions in politics, it includes the mass of the Nonconformists, and is supported by the most thoughtful and enlightened philosophic thinkers of the day. It fought a gallant battle against Mr. Forster's official forces, and his Conservative allies in the House of Commons; it is now making a vigorous protest against some of the questionable provisions of the Education Act; and if it is driven to try a fall with the Government, it will not shrink even from the responsibility of turning out Whigs and letting in Tories.

It is worth while to inquire in what particular the Nonconformists feel themselves aggrieved by Mr. Forster's Act, and what wrongs they have to complain of so serious that they feel themselves on the point of being driven out of the ranks of the party rather than submit to them. The Education Act of 1870 was a compromise, but not one of those compromises that lay the bases of lasting peace. It was a bargain between the Government and the Opposition, according to which the latter assisted the former in passing such a measure as would in some

degree meet the cry for National Education throughout the country, on condition that the influence of the clergy should be preserved almost undiminished. The Nonconformists were left out of the bargain altogether : they did not want a compromise ; but if there was to be a compromise, they surely had a claim to be partners in it, and to receive some concession in exchange for the gains of the other parties. Standing on the ground of principle, they did not ask for anything of this kind ; but it might have been expected that their champion in the Cabinet, as he was supposed to be—Mr. Forster—would have watched over their interests.

The Education League had demanded compulsory teaching, and had the support of the vast majority of Liberal electors ; it had demanded, and was similarly supported in the demand, a non-sectarian system of teaching. Mr. Forster endeavoured to escape from the responsibility by throwing upon the School Board the duty of deciding whether the education of each district should be compulsory and whether it should be sectarian. "Permissive compulsion" and "permissive sectarianism," as they have been called, were established contrary to the desire of the large and more earnest portion of the Liberal party ; and one result has been that the National Education League has charged its president, Mr. Dixon, M.P. for Birmingham, to give notice of a motion at an early period of next session, which may become famous as the rock on which Mr. Gladstone's great majority split into pieces. The terms of this notice, which sum up the objections entertained by the Nonconformists to the Act, are worth citation. Mr. Dixon is to move :—

"That, in the opinion of this House, the provisions of the Elementary Education Act are defective, and its working unsatisfactory, inasmuch as : 1. It fails to secure the general election of School Boards in town and rural districts. 2. It does not render obligatory the attendance of children at school. 3. It deals in a partial and irregular manner with the remission and payment of school fees by School Boards. 4. It allows School Boards to pay fees, out of rates levied upon the community, to denominational schools, over which the ratepayers have no control. 5. It permits School Boards to use the money of the ratepayers for the purpose of imparting dogmatic religious instruction in schools established by Local Boards. 6. By the concession of these permissive powers, it provokes religious discord throughout the country ; and by the exercise of them it violates the rights of conscience."

Let us consider in their order these grounds of objection, not only as grievances to be complained of by the Nonconformists and the Education League, but as dangerous flaws in a measure which, if it does not, as it professes, "secure the education of every child in the country," is a political, economical, and social mischief.

In the first place, it is objected that "it fails to secure the general election of School Boards in town and rural districts." The likelihood of this defect was frequently pointed out both in Parliament and in the press while the Act was passing through the House of Commons; it was contended that the clerical party and the squires would do their best to repress the formation of Boards, which would have for their object the diffusion of instruction, and, for their results, an addition to the rates; and it was shown how easily local magnates could use their influence over ignorant and selfish electors to carry out their obscurantist views. Of course the Tories and Churchmen in Parliament were indignant that such designs should be attributed to them; they professed their eagerness to extend education, although they admitted their desire to keep it as much as possible in their own hands. But twelve months' working of the Education Act revealed the motives and the tactics of these sincere friends of education. School Boards were formed in all the great towns; but in the small towns and the rural districts, where the need was assuredly greater, comparatively few were established. Nor is this to be marvelled at when we learn what was the nature of the appeals addressed to the ratepaying voters by the clerical and landed enemies of education. Here, for example, is a copy of a handbill circulated in a rural district when the question of "School Board or no School Board" was to be voted upon:—

"RATEPAYERS:

"If you want your rates increased,

"Vote for a School Board.

"If you want your rents raised,

"Vote for a School Board.

"If you would like a policeman at your door every morning,

"Vote for a School Board.

"If you want to be un-English, and take to compulsion,

"Vote for a School Board.

"A RATEPAYER."

But there are instances more remarkable than this. The Church party at Luton makes the following appeal:—

"No SCHOOL BOARD.—Agricultural Labourers and others—

"If you don't want your children, who assist to earn their living, taken from you by compulsion to attend school,—

"If you don't want your home broken up because you can't pay a fine and costs for not sending your children to school when they are earning their bread,—

"If you don't want your wages reduced because your employer would have to pay heavier rates,—



"If you don't want your rights and liberties trampled upon,—

"If you don't want to get in the hands of the policeman with his handcuffs, and to enjoy the 'Cat o' Nine Tails,' and be sent to prison,—

"Then by all means go to the poll and VOTE AGAINST A SCHOOL BOARD."

What would be the effect of such electioneering on the minds of ignorant voters we may readily guess; and we read therefore without surprise instances like the following, in which these tactics have been successful: "The township of Baildon, near to Bradford, has decided by a poll not to apply for the election of a School Board. Four hundred and thirty-one voted against the application, and out of that number two hundred and twenty could not write their own names." But other agencies besides persuasion and warning have been employed to deter rural ratepayers from voting for a School Board. The power of the landlord is brought in to crush freedom of election. A Merionethshire landlord writes to one of his tenants:—

"I shall be extremely displeased if you do not vote against a School Board in Arthog parish, and do all in your power to oppose it. You must recollect that if you once impose it on the parish it can never be got rid of. Be pleased also to remember that you will have to pay the rate, and I think you find the rates and taxes sufficiently heavy already. It will, however, always remain a charge on the farm, although you might leave. The land is mine, and from me you derive your vote. I think, therefore, that I have a right to defend my own property.—I am your well-wisher and landlord," &c.

The object of course in thus combating the formation of School Boards is to prevent even a small minority of Nonconformists from obtaining any powers of control or criticism on the education of the "rurals;" while it is hoped that in a great number of cases the clergy may be able to obtain by what are humorously called "voluntary methods," large sums of money for the support of the dogmatic teaching they desire to spread. The following instance will show their power in this respect: "In one parish a vestry meeting has been held, and a resolution passed levying a voluntary school-rate, to be collected by the district collector. Of course such a rate cannot be legally enforced, but it is understood that the parish is under *such perfect discipline* that the promoters of the rate anticipate no difficulty in collecting it in full." With such aims in view, and such a measure of success, it is obvious that the rural districts of England are left deliberately by the clergy outside the working of the Education Act. If they can get up a semblance of school teaching in their parishes sufficiently well-arranged to blind the eyes of the Education Department, they will be allowed to go on their own way, bringing up

the children of the agricultural masses in a condition of intellectual blindness worse than that of the French peasant, and perhaps as dangerous, if any further extension of the suffrage should give a share of political power to the rural population.

Thus it is apparent that the first point of objection raised by the League is proved. The Act, which professes to secure "National Education," fails to provide the necessary organization and the equitable representation of classes in the country. It leaves the "teaching" of the children of the poor still, as it has been for generations, in the hands of the Established Church.

The next objection is of a similar character, having reference to another permissive clause of the Act. School Boards are permitted to make bye-laws, subject to the approval of the Education Department, for securing the compulsory attendance of children at school; but they are not enjoined to resort to compulsion. This is not the place to discuss the difficult questions involved in the application of the compulsory principle to national elementary instruction. But as the League has placed this principle on the forefront of their demands, it is natural that now when the agitation of the question is to be renewed it should raise the point again.

The same thing may be said of the third objection—which is, that the Act "deals in a partial and irregular manner with the remission and payment of school fees by School Boards." The principle of the League is that the education given in rate-aided schools shall be gratuitous, while the Act only gives power to remit the school fees of children in such schools on proof of the poverty of the parent. The League is thus brought into collision on this point with the Act, and Mr. Dixon raises the question again in the hope that reflection may have induced many who previously voted against compulsory and gratuitous elementary education to reconsider their opinions.

But it is none of these objections that have created the religious difficulty which the Government has now to face. The three concluding clauses of Mr. Dixon's threatened motion indicate the graver dangers of the situation. Three grievances are complained of, each one of which is felt most keenly by the Nonconformists: 1st, the payment by School Boards of school fees for children attending denominational schools out of local rates; 2nd, the employment of the rates for the purpose of providing dogmatic religious teaching in schools established by local boards; and 3rd, the provocation of religious discord and the violation of the conscientious convictions of ratepayers. The first of these is by far the most formidable; it has been protested against in almost passionate accents, not alone at meetings of the Education League,

but at the gatherings of the Dissenting communities, by Liberal associations, and by such an organization as the Liberation Society. The name that has been given it will be sufficient to indicate to all who are acquainted with Nonconformist feeling, the depth and reality of the hostility it has inspired; for it is already called "the New Church Rate;" and men of the world, of mature years, of calm temper, and of no aggressive disposition, have announced their determination rather to go to gaol than to pay rates which would be used to maintain a system of teaching based on Anglicanism and Popery in rate-assisted schools.

The 25th clause of the Act, which has excited so much opposition, is, it will be observed, like so many other clauses of this remarkable statute, a purely permissive one; it runs as follows:—

"The School Board *may*, if they think fit, from time to time, for a renewable period not exceeding six months, pay the whole or any part of the school fees payable at any public elementary school by any child resident in their district whose parent is in their opinion unable from poverty to pay the same; but no such payment shall be made or refused on condition of the child attending any public elementary school other than such as may be selected by the parent; and such payment shall not be deemed to be parochial relief given to such parent."

This clause, however, is offered only as one out of three courses; for a School Board is empowered to provide for the education of the children of the indigent either by paying fees for them in denominational schools, as permitted by the above cited clause, or by remitting the fees of such children in schools under the control of the Board, or by erecting and opening free schools. And it has been pointed out as remarkable, that it is the towns which have drawn back from the responsibility of erecting free schools that have raised the religious difficulty by offering to pay fees in denominational schools out of the rates.

Let us see how the opponents of this clause regard its operation. Innumerable resolutions have been passed condemning it, but we have nowhere met with a clearer statement of the case against it than in the following schedule of objections enumerated in a memorial addressed to the London School Board by a number of working men. The memorialists request that Clause 25 of the Act shall not be acted upon by the Board for the following reasons:—

"Because it is a form of concurrent endowment, a principle which the nation has very recently emphatically condemned. 2. Because the Legislature has already provided for the payment of half the cost of existing denominational schools from public moneys; and were the proposed bye-law to be enacted, the result would be that nearly the

whole, and in some cases the whole, cost of these schools would be provided without voluntary effort. 3. Because it would be unequal in its working, giving great advantages to two or three sects which the others could not obtain if they would, and would not if they could. 4. Because it would tend to perpetuate and embitter the strife of religious parties, and would fill the minds of many of your constituents with a lasting sense of injury. 5. Because it would bring into the great work of education an element of perpetual discord, so that the cost of education, which otherwise would have been paid willingly, will be paid reluctantly and grudgingly. 6. Because, as trustees of public funds, you would grant money to institutions over which you will have no control. For these reasons (said the memorial in conclusion) we respectfully but earnestly request that you will furnish facilities for obtaining free education by the other means provided in the Act—viz., by the remission of school fees in certain cases in the schools under the control of the Board, and by the erection of such free schools as may be deemed necessary; and that you will determine under no circumstances to pay school fees in denominational schools.”

The principle of concurrent endowment which was condemned by the nation in the most emphatic manner three years ago, when it rejected Mr. Disraeli's Irish policy and accepted Mr. Gladstone's, is plainly the basis of any plan for supporting schools organized in relation to sectarian teaching out of rates levied indiscriminately from the whole population. For although the time-table clauses would prevent the forcing of religious teaching on children in Anglican or Catholic schools during the hours allotted formally to religious instruction, yet in such schools the whole course of teaching is coloured by the religion of the teachers, and the work of the clergyman is based upon that of the master. This is notoriously so in Roman Catholic schools, and that it is so in Church of England schools the subjoined extract from an official paper of the National Society, the great Anglican school organization, will prove:—

“Our work is to teach children the facts of our religion, the doctrines of our religion, the duties of our religion. We must teach them the facts of our religion, that they may be intelligent Christians—not ignorant as heathens; the doctrines, that they may not be Christians only, but Churchmen; the duties, that they may not be Churchmen only, but communicants. This last, in fact, is the object at which we are uniformly to aim—the training of the young Christian for full communion with the Church; and, as preliminary to that, a training for confirmation. *The whole school time of a child should gradually lead up to this.*”

And schools of this kind are to be supported out of rates to which ratepayers of every sect or no sect contribute. If this be not concurrent endowment, as directly given to build up the fabric of the Anglican and Catholic hierarchies as any salary to

ministers out of the national exchequer, we do not know what deserves the name.

The second objection is that the Legislature has already provided for the payment of half the cost of existing denominational schools out of Government grants, and that if the payment of fees out of rates be sanctioned, such schools will be almost wholly supported out of public money. Since the Act of 1870, three thousand applications for building grants have been made to the Education Department, which shows that the benefits to be reaped by denominationalism from Mr. Forster's Statute have not been undervalued by the clergy.

The third objection, however, is by far the gravest of all. This concurrent endowment, supposing it to be a useful and endurable thing in the abstract, would work unequally and iniquitously in the matter of education. From causes partly traceable to the history of Nonconformity in England—to the dominance of the Church and the weakness of the Dissenting sects—and partly to those principles of Nonconformity which have never encouraged the degradation of religion into a mere subject of school-teaching forced upon the children, it has come to pass that by far the greater proportion of existing denominational schools have fallen into the hands of the Church of England and the Church of Rome. As proof of this statement we may cite the following figures referring to denominational schools in Manchester—certainly not a place where either Anglicanism or Romanism would be likely to be more vigorous than in other parts of England. A respectable Liberal journal in the provinces says:—

“In reference to the payment of fees out of the rates, for children sent by School Boards to denominational schools, a most instructive return has been prepared for the information of the Manchester School Board. About 6000 children have been sent to school by the Board, and of these 5500 have attended for a little over five weeks. The cost—that is the fees paid—amounts to 333*l.* 14*s.* 7*d.* The proportion in which the attendances and payments are divided amongst various denominations is explained in the subjoined table:—

Schools.	Children sent.	Number attended.	Fees paid.
Church of England.....	3394 ...	3050 ...	£188 18 2
Roman Catholic .....	2126 ...	1896 ...	101 2 4
Undenominational .....	543 ...	463 ...	35 19 6
Wesleyan.....	158 ...	138 ...	6 17 6
Presbyterian .....	17 ...	14 ...	0 17 1
	6238	5561	£333 14 7

If the reader will multiply these figures by the number of months in a year, and then double the results to ascertain what they will be under a system of compulsion, he will get a clear idea of the extent to

which denominations are likely to benefit by these grants out of the rates, and of the amount of money which those who object to religious teaching out of the rates will have to provide in order that this benefit may be obtained."

That the payment of those fees would tend, as the memorialists to the London School Board observe, "to perpetuate and embitter the strife of religious parties," must be evident to any one who has read a report of the debates on the subject in the School Boards. Nor is it less true that it would "fill the minds of many with a lasting sense of injury." The attitude and the language of the Nonconformists sufficiently prove this. At an important meeting of Dissenters at the Cannon Street Hotel a well known Nonconformist minister asked what course his co-religionists were going to take with reference to the Government; and he told the ministers that at the East Surrey election the Nonconformists, if they liked, might have returned a Liberal representative, but they held aloof because, while disliking the Tory party, they had lost confidence in Liberal statesmanship.

The same feeling, working still more strongly, would bring about another consequence which is deprecated in the memorial—would "bring into the great work of education an element of perpetual discord, so that the cost of education, which otherwise would be paid willingly, will be paid reluctantly and grudgingly." This is painfully true; and it is even more to be feared that the men who are now calling the education-rate, when used for denominational purposes, a "new church-rate," will decline to pay it at all. The cause of education will suffer and the cause of order will suffer; parties will be broken up and political progress hindered, and all in order to renew the lease of power over the youthful mind of the kingdom which the clergy of the Established Church have enjoyed and abused so long. The final reason urged against the adoption of "Clause 25" is, that the members of the School Board, who are trustees of public money, would, by paying the fees of children attending denominational schools, be contributing to the support of institutions beyond their control. And certainly a trustee who should thus part with power over the money given into his charge would be judged by any tribunal, taking into consideration principles not of law but of honour and morality, to have been false to his trust.

Singularly enough this dangerous and much debated clause of the Act was insufficiently discussed during the progress of the Bill, and its meaning apparently was not at first fully apprehended by the Nonconformists. It was not until after the elections of the principal School Boards, at which the cumulative vote gave to the Church party a preponderance which was altogether out of proportion to their numbers, that the friends

of free education began to perceive how the 25th Clause of the Bill might be used so as to restore in reality the predominance of the Church in education while professing to deal out equal justice to all parties.

When the Liverpool School Board determined to resort to the compulsory power given under the 74th clause of the Act, a number of ratepayers petitioned Mr. Forster to disallow the bye-law providing for the payment of fees for children attending denominational schools: the petition was refused and the act of the Board was sustained. Some months later, when the Birmingham School Board adopted a similar bye-law, the Executive Committee of the Liberal Association, not probably with any hope of moving Mr. Forster—the futility of which the case of Liverpool had shown, but by way of protest—presented a memorial to the Education Department, which with the answer we may quote here to show the attitude of “My Lords.” The memorial ran thus:—

“To the Right Honourable the Lords of the Committee of Her Majesty’s Privy Council on Education.

“The memorial of the undersigned respectfully sheweth—

“That your memorialists are the Executive Committee of the Birmingham Liberal Association. That they are informed that the Birmingham School Board have sent to your Lordships for approval certain bye-laws, one of which provides for the payment of the school fees of children educated in denominational schools.

“That your memorialists believe that such payments out of funds contributed to by persons of all religious persuasions cannot be made without infringing the principles of religious liberty and equality, and that if this bye-law is put in force, it will produce the same animosity and irritation which was produced by the enforced payment of church-rates. And your memorialists therefore pray that the said bye-law may not be approved by your Right Honourable Board.

“Signed in behalf and by direction of the Executive Committee of the Birmingham Liberal Association.

“JOHN SKIRROW WRIGHT, Chairman.

“JOHN JAFFRAY, Treasurer.

“GEORGE BAKER, Hon. Secretary.”

The Department replied in the following terms:—

“Education Department, Privy Council Office,  
Downing Street, London, 9th August, 1871.

“SIR,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your memorial.

“The question as to the propriety of sanctioning the 7th bye-law submitted by the Birmingham School Board was very carefully considered before the order was passed, of which a copy is enclosed. Their Lordships did not feel that they would be justified in withholding their approval from a bye-law which is framed in strict accordance

with the provisions of the Elementary Education Act, and in conformity with the terms of other bye-laws already sanctioned by Her Majesty in Council.

"I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,  
" F. R. SANDFORD.

"The Secretary, Birmingham Liberal Association, Birmingham."

But although the Education Department has shown itself so scrupulous in declining to interfere with the carrying out of a permissive clause of the Act, it has not apparently preserved the same neutrality in cases where School Boards have declined to use the permissive powers of "Clause 25." The Boards of Walsall and Portsmouth took the latter course; and the following letter from the Chairman of the former Board will show how by way of offering advice, Mr. Forster endeavoured to overrule the decision of that body:—

"Fern Hill House, Birmingham Road, Walsall,  
August 29th, 1871.

"F. Adams, Esq.

"*Re* Walsall School Board.

"DEAR SIR,—I send you by this post a copy of our bye-laws, which have been sent up to the Education Department for approval. Bye-law No. 4 (page 6) provides for the remitting of fees in School Board schools only. It is to the remarks of the Department on this bye-law that I wish to draw your attention. The following is an extract dated Whitehall, Aug. 29th, 1871:—

"'With reference to bye-law No. 4, which provides that the School Board may remit the fees payable at any school provided by the Board, I am to state that such bye-law will be allowed. I am, however, directed to point out that, in their opinion, it would not be just to deprive a parent of his right to choose the particular public elementary school to which he will send his child, because while he is compelled by these bye-laws to send his child to school, he is unable, from poverty, to pay his school fee. But my Lords cannot doubt that the School Board will see the justice of making use of the power they possess under Section 25, in favour of any such parent.'

"Many of us here have conscientious scruples to pay rates to propagate creeds, some of which we believe to be hurtful to body and soul. Ought we not to be considered? Leaving this side of the question, I consider it a breach of faith to the Liberal party in this country that this pressure is allowed to be put upon the different School Boards. We have been told by Mr. Forster that it is left to the School Boards to do as they think fit, and that the Act would be fairly worked. What result this letter will have upon our School Board I cannot tell. It will come before us to-morrow, and will give new life to our late defeated Denominationalists.

"What is to be done? It will not do to sit down quietly and allow this unfair meddling by a Department which ought to be im-



partial in the administration of the Act. It ought to be exposed and resisted by all means we can put forth.

"In haste, yours most respectfully,

"F. T. HOLDEN,

"Chairman of the School Board."

But though the payment of school fees in denominational institutions for the children of pauper parents is in the opinion of the Nonconformists the most serious "blot in the Bill," there is another provision, also leading to permissive sectarianism, which they denounce. The rate-supported schools founded by School Boards might naturally be supposed to be emancipated by the statute from every taint of compulsory religious teaching. But this is very far from being the case: the Act imposes only one restriction on the religious or sectarian teaching that may be given in the schools founded by Boards and maintained out of the rates; it is forbidden to teach in these schools any "religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination." But it is only formularies and catechisms that are thus excluded; the teacher may instruct his pupils in all the dogmas of the Anglican Church, or the Catholic Church, or Calvinistic Presbyterianism, or Methodistic Arminianism, or whatever other type of sectarian faith may find favour with the majority of the Board. It is obvious that the whole course of instruction may thus be tinged with sectarianism, and that no time-table clause or other mechanical expedient for securing freedom of conscience would be effective against these insidious operations.

It is furthermore complained, and with perfect justice, that in consequence of these powers of permissive sectarianism, the election of members for the School Boards has been conducted as if the issue of the contest in nearly every case were whether one sect or another were to secure predominance, instead of lying as it ought to lie between various schools of educationalists. In no School Board election with which we are acquainted has the contest turned upon the diverse views of effective school teaching, although it is known that on this subject the most serious differences of opinion exist. In town as well as in country districts, in London as well as in the provinces, the battle has been fought solely on the ground of sectarianism, either between conflicting sects or between the non-sectarian school and their opponents. Religious differences which had long slumbered, and which it had been agreed by all parties to bury in oblivion while they met to co-operate in the work of civil life, were reinvigorated by the struggle. Bigotry has received a new portion of strength and vitality, and the work of reconciling classes and creeds throughout the country, which

had been nearly completed as all men hoped when the church-rates' battle came to an end, has been at once and perhaps irreparably undone. Nothing that we have known of in the recent history of England has exceeded in unscrupulousness, virulence, and daring the conduct of the clerical party almost everywhere in those School Board elections. And unfortunately when one party exhibits a violent temper, or shows a disposition to use unfair means for securing a victory, its opponents are too often demoralized by that example, reveal the same passions, and resort to the same weapons. No political contest since the first Reform Bill, has done more to sunder the elements of society in every part of England than these contests into which religious bitterness has been so unwarrantably imported. Nor was it to be expected that men chosen under such influences, and considering themselves specially the representatives of the excited feelings which had borne them into power, should preserve in their official character a decent moderation. We find, indeed, that in the debates of the School Boards the religious question is constantly rising to the surface, constantly exciting passions and provoking strife, hindering the practical work of education, and discrediting the whole system established by the Education Act. For all these reasons—and some of them, at least, it cannot be denied, are very weighty—the Nonconformists object to the permissive sectarianism of the Education Act, on the ground that it has substituted and will continue to substitute religious rivalries, instead of large and practical views of education, as the motives which impel men to come forward as candidates for the School Boards, and which govern in the vast majority of cases the votes of the electors. In fact, the Boards under the present system are composed of persons who—we will not say are careless about educational progress, but who certainly consider educational progress an object of secondary importance compared with the success of the policy which their sectarian supporters elected them to sustain. The work of national education is arduous enough, surely, to demand that all the powers of those who control it shall be surrendered to that service, and men who pursue it merely as a secondary end will never succeed in basing its fabric upon sure foundations.

Much of what the Nonconformists complain of in the Government measure will find agreement among persons who have no special leanings towards Nonconformists, no sympathies with the dogmas of its leading sects, and no preference for its ministers as compared with the more cultured clergy of the Church of England. But the Nonconformists in this instance, as in so many others which history records, are fighting the battle of religious liberty. Their position in the country, their long sub-

jugation, their sturdy resistance, their ultimate triumph, all their traditions, and all the teaching of their greatest men, have taught them to struggle to the death for liberty of conscience. A great meeting of Nonconformists at the Cannon Street Hotel protested that, although as Nonconformists they had especial reason to strive for religious equality, it was not in the interests of Nonconformist sects that they denounced the system of sectarian instruction permitted and encouraged under the Education Act:—

“We are not indeed,” they say in their memorial, “disposed to submit to injustice; but it is because we believe that there are at stake far wider interests than those of any ecclesiastical politics that we venture to urge our views on your attention. We protest against any attempt to maintain by unfair protection a system which entangles national education with ecclesiastical discussions. We deny that the secular instruction of the people is the proper business of religious corporations. With the sincerest gratitude for much that they have accomplished under historical conditions which, in the metropolis at least, have entirely passed away, we cannot admit their right to stand in the way of that broad, unsectarian, and comprehensive scheme of national instruction, to the necessity of which all signs of the time are pointing. If the system of sectarian schools has yet life enough to continue its work by the voluntary devotion of its adherents, we have no wish to hasten its extinction by any external hindrances; but if it has not, we maintain it to be as inexpedient as unjust to protect by means of the rates any obstructive rivalry with the new national schools.”

Nothing could be clearer, manlier, firmer, more consistent with sound views of the political relationship between the State and religious education, than this protest. It is surely inexpedient to cut away on the one side that of which we are endeavouring to promote the growth on the other. Parliament may have been dishonest in its professions when it passed the Education Act. But it did profess a desire then to establish a large national system, free from dogmatic teaching of religion, and in accordance with the demands of modern thought and educational progress. It was said, by the way—Mr. Forster and Mr. Gladstone frequently used the argument—that it would be unwise and unthankful to reject the aid which the denominational schools offered for the education of the people. It was urged that these schools would be useful to supplement the work of the national system. But it was certainly not the intention of the country that the national system should be called into being merely to supplement denominationalism where it had conspicuously failed. The national schools were to be supported by a rate specially levied for that purpose, nor was it originally the intention of Parliament, or

at any time the wish of the country, that the denominational schools should have a share in this rate. Least of all was it contemplated that the rates should be applied to foster the denominational schools, and by maintaining and multiplying them to prevent the establishment of the national system. This use of the rates would make an education-rate unpopular, and possibly throw insuperable difficulties in the way of its being levied. An eminent statesman has remarked that, "If a payment were made out of the rates on which ratepayers, as such, were not consulted, and over which they had no control, it would become a cause of discontent and exasperation." It was Mr. Gladstone who made this statement, and he may find, perhaps in a very unpleasant way, the truth of his prediction.

The excuses offered by the advocates of "Clause 25" for that anomalous part of the Education Act are mainly three. It is urged that on the ground of economy it is desirable to foster the denominational schools, which are partly sustained by voluntary contributions, rather than to rely entirely upon national schools, which must be entirely supported out of the rates. This is an argument which weighs very strongly with persons of the class chosen to represent the ratepayers upon vestries and boards of guardians—a class which has obtained a footing and a considerable share of power upon some of the School Boards. It happens, however, that as far as London at all events is concerned this economy is a mere illusion. The School Board is bound by the Act of Parliament to provide school accommodation for the entire number of children who cannot be accommodated in existing schools. There will be a large deficiency, and schools will have to be erected; and then the question will arise, whether the children of indigent parents are to obtain their gratuitous teaching in the Board schools, or in those of the denominations? Obviously the proper place for the children whose education has to be provided gratuitously by the State, is in the schools directly connected with the State. Parents who are able to pay for the teaching of their children may choose, if they please, those schools in which the luxury of religious instruction is purveyed. They may fill the half of the empty benches of the denominational schools, but nothing will be gained by the public in the way of economy if the School Boards should fill those benches with destitute children paid for out of the rates.

Happily, however, there is little need to argue this part of the question. The select-vestryman, though influential is not yet predominant on the School Boards, and very few, we believe, even of the extreme sectarian partisans would be willing, as the Cannon Street Hotel memorialists observe, to do injustice merely

for the sake of economy, or "to stunt a great scheme of National Education for the sake of a temporary saving." To do even the most bigoted of the sectarianists justice, we must allow that though they may use arguments based upon the alleged necessity of keeping down the rates for the purpose of influencing ignorant and selfish ratepayers, they are not themselves inclined to sacrifice any ends they have in view for the sake of sparing the public a small part of what has been judged to be a just and necessary burden.

The next argument, however, in favour of the payment of fees for destitute children in denominational schools is more specious. It appeals to a principle always cherished by Englishmen, and not least by English Nonconformists—Liberty of Conscience. It is urged that when we find the children of a man so steeped in poverty that he cannot pay the miserably small fees of an elementary school, growing up in ignorance and being trained to crime, we have no right to take those children and give them a sound training in all secular branches of instruction, unless at the same time we are prepared to comply with the peculiar taste of the parent in matters of theology, and to provide according to his wishes the sort of religious instruction he may demand. If we do not thus regulate the action of the State by the wishes of the father, who according to the supposition has been called upon to provide for the intellectual maintenance of his children, we are, it is said, coercing his conscience. It appears, however, that if this argument be pressed to its logical conclusion, it strikes at the compulsory principle in education altogether, unless the advocates of the Act are prepared to maintain that the conscience of an Episcopalian, or a Romanist, or a Jew, may be so coerced, but that the conscience of a Presbyterian, an Independent, a Baptist, a Unitarian, or a Secularist, is made of tougher material; for the denominational schools in existence are almost exclusively supported and under the control of Anglicans and Roman Catholics, with the addition in some places of Jewish and Wesleyan schools. If in a particular district, where there is a Wesleyan school, the parent belonging to that denomination who is unable to pay the fees of his children, will be able under Clause 25 to have the fees paid for them out of the rates in a school belonging to his sect; otherwise he will protest, or a protest will be entered on his behalf by some clerical partisan, that his conscience has been coerced. But suppose the same parent to remove to a district where there is no Wesleyan school; will he be allowed to protest against the violence done to his conscience when his children are sent to receive secular instruction in the schools of the Board? or will his protest be admitted as an excuse for his disobeying the law? And if not

in the latter case, why in the former? The position of the Wesleyan in this supposed instance is precisely that of the great mass of Protestant Nonconformists in almost every school district in England; "not one in a thousand of whom," the Cannon Street memorialists aver, "could find a public elementary school where the religious teaching would satisfy his conscience." This surely is enough to show that an excessive tenderness for the consciences of some citizens is quite consistent with the coolest disregard for the consciences of others. But we disclaim absolutely the right of the man who is unable to pay for the education of his children to dictate to the State whether or not that education shall be accompanied with this or that sort of religious teaching. With singular unanimity and decision the people of this country have resolved that the State shall be neutral in matters of religion; and although the Established Church, strong in its wealth and its traditions, still stands erect, in defiance of the spirit of the time, it is certain that no new endowments of religion, direct or indirect, will be tolerated in these kingdoms. This being so, and voluntarism being generally accepted as the principle which should regulate the relations between individual citizens and the State, it is plain that the privilege of selecting religious teaching for a family is in the nature of a luxury, which a man who has to appeal to the public for the teaching of his children is not in a position to claim. It wrongs no man to take his children, whom he is allowing to grow up in ignorance, and instruct them in reading, writing, and arithmetic; and this is a thing for which the community are perfectly willing to pay, knowing that an educated citizen is worth far more, socially and economically, than an ignorant and brutalized one. But we are not willing to pay for providing theological luxuries in such cases; and as conscience is so much talked about in the matter, we are entitled to ask that some consideration should be given to the consciences of those who have the strongest objection to pay for the inculcation of what they believe to be erroneous and mischievous doctrines. The whole mass of the Nonconformists detest the dogmas of Catholicism, and believe the faith of the Anglican Church to be largely mingled with error. They do not ask Anglicans or Catholics to contribute to the propagation of Nonconformist opinions, and they do not see the equity of an arrangement which would give all the advantage to the Church of England, the Church of Rome, and some small communities of Jews and Wesleyans.

The third argument in favour of the application of Clause 25 is, that unless the Board avails itself of the accommodation now accessible in denominational schools, the enforcement of compulsory attendance must be indefinitely postponed. This

argument applies peculiarly to the case of London, where it is evident that there are difficulties in the acquisition of proper sites for schools, and where the erection of suitable buildings will be a tedious work. It is assumed that valuable time may be saved by making use of the existing schools under Clause 25. The reply of the Nonconformist memorialists to this pretext is complete, both as an argument and as a practical suggestion. They say—

“That any effective operation of the proposed bye-law is necessarily impossible until your Board has supplied the acknowledged lack of accommodation. If we are rightly informed, the school accommodation which in all respects fulfils the requirements of the Education Department, is not sufficient for anything near the number of children requiring public elementary schools. The children cannot be driven into school unless there are schools open to receive them. Under such circumstances, then, anything like a really working bye-law is impossible, unless some temporary means can be found for meeting a pressing want. Should the Board see fit to make temporary use of hired premises for this purpose, it will soon have its own schools in all parts of London, and can open them to all who need a free education. We do not presume to advise the Board on this subject; we only insist upon the dilemma—*either* the Board will devise temporary school accommodation, and in that case will have no occasion whatever to send the destitute to denominational schools; *or* the Board will not take this course, and in that case no compulsion is possible. Should it, however, be proposed to try, what appears difficult of conception, a partial and imperfect compulsion—should it be thought that the poorest non-attendants should first be seized upon, and forced into the denominational schools, where their fees would be paid by the Board—we submit that this compulsory attendance at denominational schools, stamped by a decidedly religious character, would be diametrically opposed to the spirit of the Act, and would afford a strange illustration of those rights of conscience in the interests of which these schools are supposed to exist. No conscience clause could deprive such a proceeding of the appearance of persecution. Besides, the places in the only efficient elementary schools being thus filled, parents willing and able to pay their children's school fees in addition to the rates would, in many instances, be driven to inferior schools already condemned, and would thus be providing for the children of perhaps less industrious parents a better education than they could secure for their own. But if partial compulsion be thus impossible, we are thrown back on the dilemma already stated.”

We have now enumerated the arguments with which the clerical party and their ministerial auxiliaries defend this distortion of the original purpose and only justifiable aim of the Education Act. The real motive which actuates them is not of course allowed to appear in serious discussion, but it comes to the surface often enough in local debates, in the exultant speeches of reckless

clergymen, and in the energy with which the Church of England and the Church of Rome are pressing forward their plans of school extension. It remains for the country to determine whether it is now going to acquiesce in the creation through the length and breadth of the land of a number of vested interests in sectarian schools, emancipated from the control of the representatives of the people, yet maintained by the taxation of the people, and, above all, in the hands of two powerful religious organizations, both hostile to free government and to free thought. It is not the Nonconformists alone, but every man who values Liberal principles, and who looks with hope to the ever-enduring battle between reason and dogma, who will feel it essential to warn Mr. Gladstone at this crisis how great and irreparable is the mischief he is doing, and how serious are the dangers into which he is dragging his party. The disaffection of the Nonconformists towards the Liberal chief is undoubtedly a serious element in the political complications of the day, but it is the cause of that disaffection which makes it perilous to Mr. Gladstone and his official supporters. If the Nonconformists were to secede from the Liberal ranks for some pique of a personal nature, or through the disappointment of some selfish ambition, they might indeed drive a minister from office for a few months, but they could not shake his power in the country. Now, however, the case is very different. If there is to be a disruption of the party—and it rests with Mr. Gladstone to say whether there shall be or not—the constituencies will see clearly that those who have seceded have done so upon questions of principle vitally implicated in the whole framework of Liberal policy, and that the leaders of the party, trafficking with their competitors for place in compromises and concessions, have broken faith with their political creed and with those who placed them in power. What the result may be to individuals, should such an appeal to the country take place, we know not and we do not greatly care, but we feel assured that it is not those who have adhered to principle who will lose either influence or character in the conflict.

---



## INDEPENDENT SECTION.

*[Under the above title a limited portion of the Westminster Review is occasionally set apart for the reception of able articles, which, though harmonizing with the general spirit and aims of the work, contain opinions at variance with the particular ideas or measures it may advocate. The object of the Editor, in introducing this department, is to facilitate the expression of opinion by men of high mental power and culture, who, while they are zealous friends of freedom and progress, yet differ widely on special points of great practical concern, both from the Editor and from each other.]*

### ART. VII.—A THEORY OF WAGES.

**M**R. THORNTON has rendered a great service to political economy, by his attack on the theory of supply and demand. He has shown, not merely that it does not explain the phenomena of price, but that it is not a correct description of the commonest cases of everyday bargaining. He has thus cleared the way for a new theory, but does not profess to have constructed one himself. It is the object of the present article to do a part of what he has left undone, in relation to the rate of wages. Before offering an explanation, it will be well to examine those which have been already given by former writers. On first taking up the question why a certain rate of wages prevails, the idea is naturally suggested, that the rate is determined by the competition of employers and employed, the employer selecting those who agree to work on the lowest terms; the only limit being that minimum rate which is sufficient to keep the labourers alive. This, accordingly, is the explanation given by Turgot, one of the earliest writers on the subject; but a little consideration will show that, in reality, it explains nothing. If we ask why wages are higher in America than in England, it only tells us, that it is because the competition of labourers is keener here than there; and if we ask what is meant by keener competition, we only receive for answer, such as is sufficient to reduce wages; it does not tell us why wages are seldom or never reduced to that minimum rate which is just sufficient to support life. It simply states the fact, and tells the employer that he has to pay a certain rate, because the workman will not work for less.

Adam Smith arrived at the same conclusion as Turgot, but he devoted more space to the discussion of the subject, and threw out hints, and collected materials, which will be found serviceable in the present inquiry. "In that original state of things,"

he says, " which precedes both the appropriation of land and the accumulation of stock, the whole produce of labour belongs to the labourer. He has neither master nor landlord to share with him. Had this state continued, the wages of labour would have augmented with all those improvements in its productive powers, to which the division of labour gives occasion."

Seeing that this was no longer the case, and that rent and profit were both paid out of the produce, he supposed that this law was no longer in force, and considered that the rate of wages was the result of a contract between masters and workmen. Wages, according to him, were highest, where the fund destined to their payment was rapidly increasing; moderate where it was gradually increasing; and lowest where it was stationary; and he illustrated this position by reference to America, Great Britain, and China respectively. This however can hardly be called an explanation, for it amounts to no more than this, that wages increase when the fund out of which they are paid increases, and does not show what is the cause of such increase, nor why different rates of wages should prevail in different countries which were progressing at the same rate. Ricardo distinguished between a natural and a market rate, the former being that which is necessary to enable the labourers to bring up their families in that state of comfort which they consider necessary, and the latter being that which is actually paid. The former is determined by the habits of the people, since that rate must be paid which is required to induce them to propagate their race; and the latter is determined by supply and demand.

Before proceeding further, it is necessary to point out the distinction between money wages and real wages. Money wages are the sum of money, and real wages the quantity of commodities, given to the labourers. Ricardo thought that the natural rate of money wages might be raised by food becoming dearer. When wheat was at 4*l.* per quarter, the labourer might receive 6 quarters, or 24*l.* a year; and if wheat rose to 5*l.* a quarter, he might receive 5 quarters or 25*l.*, and this Ricardo called a rise of wages. He does not attempt to prove that this rise would follow from the rise of the price of food, nor does he even say that the rise of price would necessarily diminish the labourer's command of coin. It cannot be said, therefore, that he explained the rise of the natural rate, but he attempted to show how the market rate might rise above the natural rate. Like Adam Smith, he considered that the increase of national wealth might for a time raise wages, and gave the same explanation of the high rate prevailing in America—namely, that wealth in that country was rapidly increasing. Before he wrote, the suggestions of Adam Smith had been developed by Malthus into a comprehensive theory of population, and he therefore

supposed that if wages increased, population would do so likewise, and soon bring them down to their former level. The only check which he saw to such a process, was the chance that while wages were high, the labourers would become accustomed to greater comfort, and prevent their numbers from increasing to the point which would deprive them of what they had gained. In this way, a rise of the market rate might be followed by a rise of the natural rate, which would become permanent. Later writers have adopted Ricardo's theory, without altering more than the mode of expressing it. Senior reduced it to the palpable truism, that the rate of wages depends on the proportion between the number of the labourers who earn them, and the quantity and quality of the commodities devoted to the support of all the labouring families; but in general, it is said to depend on the ratio between the wages fund and population. This then may be taken as the current theory, and it is this which Mr. Thornton (in his work on labour) has attacked by utterly denying that there is such a thing as a fund destined to the payment of wages, and asserting that employers have no particular desire to devote any definite proportion of their capital to that object.\*

It has been replied, that though employers have no personal desire to do so, yet, in a given state of the arts, there is a certain proportion between the three divisions of capital—viz., plant, materials, and wages, and that they must keep this proportion in order to carry on their business profitably. But in this argument there seems to be a misapprehension. It is true that there is a proportion between the number of machines, the quantity of materials, and the *number of labourers* employed, but it is not easy to see that the quantity of money spent in the purchase of the two former bears any necessary ratio to the quantity given to the third. If the number of furnaces, and the quantity of flour and eggs used in Messrs. Huntley and Palmer's factory were known, a man thoroughly acquainted with the business of biscuit-making, would be able to give a pretty good guess at the number of men employed there, but he would hardly be able, from knowing the price of the furnaces, flour, and eggs, to tell the rate of wages prevailing in the factory, unless he also knew the rate given in other factories, or else, both the price obtained for the whole of the biscuits, and Messrs. Huntley and Palmer's profit. To give an arithmetical illustration:—Suppose that an employer has a capital of 3000*l.*, of which 1000*l.* are spent in

---

\* Since writing the above, I have received from Mr. Francis D. Longe a copy of his pamphlet, "A Refutation of the Wage-fund Theory of Modern Political Economy as enunciated by Mr. Mill and Mr. Fawcett, M.P.," Longmans, 1869, which was first published in 1866, and in which he demonstrated the unsatisfactory character of the theory in question, even more conclusively than Mr. Thornton, and quite independently of him.

machines, and 1000*l.* in materials, and 25 men are enough to work them, and only 25 are to be had. What motive can be assigned, which would induce the employer to spend the remaining 1000*l.* all in wages, when a smaller sum, 500*l.* for instance, will suffice to maintain the labourers in working activity? If the value of the produce were 3300*l.*, it would be neither more nor less, as long as 25 men were employed, and there seems to be no reason why the employer should be content with a profit of 300*l.*, when he could get 800*l.* If, however, it were true that the wages fund was a definite portion of the capital of the country, it would be of little moment, as we should only be told, that wages rise because capital increases. Mr. Thornton, after having thus cast aside the theory that wages are determined by the number of labourers, and the fund destined to maintain them, gives it as his opinion, that they are determined by competition, that there is no law regulating competition, and, consequently, none regulating wages.

Thus after a century has elapsed, during which many of the greatest minds in Europe have been occupied in investigating the subject, the conclusion is reached that nothing is known.

The confession is inevitable, that no theory has yet been propounded which will embrace every case of a bargain between employer and workmen. No attempt will be made in the following pages to explain how it is that the cabman, who receives a shilling for driving a passenger from Harley Street to Piccadilly, receives eighteenpence for driving another back from Piccadilly to Harley Street, nor why two workmen of equal capacity, doing similar work in the same shop, receive wages varying to the extent of five shillings per week. I only undertake the more modest task of endeavouring to account for the great differences between the rates of wages prevailing in different countries, or at different times. Before doing so, it is necessary to explain that by wages, are always meant real wages—*i.e.*, measured in commodities, and it is assumed, that if farm-labourers be taken as the standard, wages in all other employments will be proportioned to theirs, being lower or higher, accordingly as the work is more or less agreeable. The problem, therefore, is reduced to this: Why do labourers in general receive more of a given commodity in one age or country than in another? To the question thus put, the answer naturally suggests itself;—Because less labour is required to produce that commodity. Thus, if on the worst land in cultivation in America the labour of one man can produce twenty quarters of wheat, and on the worst land cultivated in England only ten quarters, wages will, *cæteris paribus*, be higher in America than in England. Not, be it observed, twice as high, for if both the English and American labourers have to expend two-thirds of their time, or their wages, in pro-

curing the same quantity of clothing and furniture, and if both consume the same quantity of wheat, then the American will only have the advantage of being able to devote one-sixth of his earnings to the obtaining of something which the Englishman is obliged to dispense with.

I contend that the rate of wages of agricultural labour is determined by the efficiency of the labour of men working on their own account, who have only a few tools to assist them. The proportion between the rates of wages prevailing in different employments, I do not now seek to explain; and it has been well explained by Adam Smith and others.

It will be better, in order to get a clearer view, to take some other country than England, and I take Australia to illustrate the argument. In Australia the constant complaint of employers is that their labourers desert them in order to set up farming on their own account. Obviously, therefore, employers are obliged to offer such wages as will give the labourer the same, or nearly the same, quantity of food, clothing, and other necessities and luxuries, as he could produce for himself. Suppose that the average labour of one man for one year produces, as in New South Wales it appears to do, forty-one quarters of wheat, each labourer who works for a capitalist will demand forty-one quarters, or their equivalent. Six bushels of wheat are said to be the average annual consumption of one individual; the labourer, therefore, who has a wife and six children, would only require for his own family six quarters, and would be able to devote the value of thirty-five quarters to the purchase of other articles of food, clothing, &c.

If working on his own account, and possessed of as many as six children, it will only be necessary for him to devote one-seventh of his labour to growing wheat, and he would have six-sevenths of his time to spare for making his own clothes, building himself a house, and satisfying all his other wants. If he consents to devote himself to the production of wheat alone, or of grain crops alone, it would only be on condition that other members of society will furnish him in exchange for his wheat with all those articles which he could produce for himself. Of course the same holds good with regard to other employments; and an Australian smith or carpenter would expect to receive for his labour as much as he could produce for himself. The high rate of wages which prevails in Australia is therefore to be attributed to the fertility of the soil, which enables men with the same amount of labour to produce a much greater quantity of food than they can do in Europe.

In Germany it is, or was, usual for every family to make its own clothes, and, indeed, to supply almost entirely all its wants;

and foreign commerce only concerned the large towns, while the village was self-supporting. In Germany, moreover, the land is generally held by peasant proprietors, and there is therefore no difficulty in applying the argument to the case of that country.

If a German peasant can produce for himself a certain amount of food and clothing, his son will not work for an employer unless the latter will give him the same amount of food, and either leave him the time to make his own clothes, or will give him money to be exchanged for them. If the employer does not offer this, the young peasant will set up farming on his own account, or will wait for a more favourable opportunity. The common objection that the labourer cannot wait, has not much force in this case, since the father who has maintained the son up to the age when he is able to work, can maintain him for another year, and would in such a case have every motive to do so. The reason why Germany and Australia have been selected, rather than England, is that owing to legal and political abuses, which it is unnecessary to enter into here, the English peasant is practically unable to set up farming on his own account, and it would therefore be a mockery to tell him that if he was not satisfied with the wages he received, he was welcome to work for himself, and to see whether he could produce more. The case of England, therefore, requires separate investigation, but will, if carefully examined, be found to furnish no exception to the rule.

It is true, that the Dorsetshire labourer cannot procure a piece of land for his own, but the competition of employers, to a great extent, does for him what the free access to uncultivated land does for the Australian settler. Taking the rate of wages in Dorsetshire as eight shillings a week, and the average price of wheat as forty-five shillings per quarter, this would give the labourer nine quarters per annum. It is evident then, that each labourer produces, on an average, nine quarters per annum. If he produced less, the employer would suffer a loss, and if he produced more than this, together with what is required to replace the seed, and to compensate the labourers employed to produce the tools used, then the employer would realize more than the ordinary rate of profit, and other employers would come into competition and offer higher wages. The competition of different employments would work to the same end. If a farm-labourer could produce nine quarters of wheat in a year, and a working shoemaker can produce ninety pairs of shoes, then one quarter would exchange for ten pairs of shoes, and the working shoemaker and the farm-labourer will receive equal proportions of each other's labour.

Suppose that the shoemaker were able to produce ninety pairs of shoes, and exchange them for nine quarters, but the farm-

labourer did not receive nine quarters, the two occupations being considered equally agreeable, more men would set up as shoemakers, and fewer would hire themselves out as farm-labourers.

It is not meant that a man working with his own capital would receive no more than one working with another's capital, but merely that the earnings of the one would be proportionate to the other, the difference being such as to compensate the sacrifice submitted to, in order to make the tools, or to save the food required.

If the foregoing argument be correct, the different rates of wages prevailing in different countries, must be explained chiefly by reference to the fertility of their soil, regard being also had to the degree of knowledge and perseverance with which labour is directed. The labourers of the United States receive high wages because they have a fertile soil at their disposal, and know how to cultivate it so as to draw a large produce from it. The Indians whom they have displaced, had the same soil, but had neither the knowledge nor the industry requisite to obtain so much from it. The Mexican labourer can obtain by a week's labour sufficient to support him through the year, but he is not able to use his spare time to much advantage, and has few facilities for exchanging his surplus produce for manufactured articles. I will now take the case of Yorkshire, where the rate of wages is twelve shillings a week, so that, taking wheat as before at forty-five shillings per quarter, the Yorkshire labourer can earn fourteen quarters by a year's labour, while his Dorsetshire brother can only earn nine. Mr. Fawcett accounts for this by saying that the manufactories of Yorkshire draw off a number of men, and that, therefore, the supply of farm-labourers being diminished, the capital divided amongst them affords a larger quotient. This, however, is hardly an explanation, but a statement of the fact, since the statement that wages are high implies that the same amount of money is divided amongst a smaller number of men.

The explanation, moreover, overlooks the fact that the farmer has to pay his men out of the corn which they produce, and the thing to be explained is, the fact that the Yorkshire farmer, employing the same number of men, is able to give them more corn than the Dorsetshire farmer can do. He can only do so permanently if the labourers permanently produce more. Suppose that with a capital of 1200*l.*, of which 800*l.* is spent in seed and implements, and 400*l.* in wages to twenty men, the Dorsetshire farmer can produce corn to the value of 1300*l.*, he may continue to pay his labourers 20*l.* a year each; but if the Yorkshire farmer with the same number of men, and the same outlay on tools, &c., can produce no more, he cannot pay his men more,

because if he did he would receive a smaller profit than his Dorsetshire brother. As therefore the corn of Dorsetshire and Yorkshire is brought to the same market, and sold at the same price, and as there is no reason to suppose that the farmer's profit is higher in the former county than in the latter, it follows that the higher wages received in Yorkshire are the consequence of the greater facilities which are there presented to the production of corn. The manufacturing industry of the county offers a ready explanation of these greater facilities, since it enables the farmer to obtain better instruments, at the same, or a lower price, to obtain more easily a supply of manure, and by scattering towns more thickly through the country places the markets within easier reach.

It will perhaps be objected that no explanation has here been given of the causes which prevent the people of Yorkshire from losing the advantages which they at present possess. Population, it will be said, will increase, and soon bring down wages to their former level. It might be sufficient to reply, that it has only been attempted to explain facts as they stand, and that as wages are, in fact, higher in Yorkshire than in Dorsetshire, it is sufficient explanation to point out the circumstances which render production more easy in one place than in the other.

But the objection seems to be founded on the idea of a proportion between capital and labourers, and to assume that an increase in the number of labourers must lower the dividend. On the principle above explained, the capital would increase with the labourers, and both might do so to a considerable extent. Suppose that Yorkshire contained 30,000 families, each producing nine, and consuming three quarters—they could thus support 60,000 other families, and the general rate of wages would be equivalent to nine quarters. Now suppose the improvement to take place which would enable each family to produce fourteen quarters—the 30,000 families would then be able to produce enough for themselves, and 110,000 others, the general rate of wages would be equivalent to fourteen quarters, and 50,000 additional families would be able to devote themselves to some new employment, so that the labourer's comfort would be really, and not merely nominally, increased, by his being able to devote part of his wages to the purchase of their products. Thus the increase of the product from nine to fourteen quarters, if followed by a proportionate increase of population, from 90,000 to 140,000 families, would nevertheless raise wages, and might do so considerably, since a larger population would render possible a greater division of labour, and admit of many articles being produced at a smaller cost. It is true, that if population were to increase to more than 140,000 families, it would be



necessary to resort to poorer soils, which, even under the new conditions, would only yield thirteen quarters, and possibly less ; but it is not likely that population would increase in this way, because it would be apparent to every individual who should commence farming in order to maintain a family under such circumstances, that he was receiving less than his father and neighbours, and this would in most cases be a sufficient check ; and if a few individuals did so, their example would be sufficient warning to the rest, and those who could not obtain employment at the ordinary rate of wages would most probably either remain out of work, or emigrate to another part of the country, or to another country.

An increase of population, in short, is the consequence and not the cause of an increase of food. It is not likely that wages would be lowered, unless a considerable emigration took place from Dorsetshire, or some other place where a lower rate prevailed. Mr. Fawcett has shown how the obstacles interposed by the ignorance of the Dorsetshire men, the cost of removal, and the Law of Settlement prevent such a movement. With regard to this last head, it is interesting to remark how the policy of the landlords, who impede the settlement of strangers on their property, defeats its own end ; for if the Yorkshire farmers paid no more than Dorsetshire wages, the whole of the advantage of their position would be reaped by the landlords in the form of rent. The question now presents itself, What are the means of raising wages in the sense of giving a greater quantity of commodities to the labourer ? It is commonly argued that the way to do this, is to increase the capital of the country, while population remains stationary or increases less rapidly. I have endeavoured to show that the rate of wages might be raised if population increased in precisely the same ratio as food ; and if therefore the people exercised no more than their accustomed degree of prudential restraint. The ascribing of a rise of wages to an increase of capital, as compared to the number of labourers, seems to be founded on a vague idea of the subject, as it is hoped the following illustration will show.

Suppose there are in a country 100,000 labourers, each receiving ten quarters of corn, and that the farmers by saving for a length of time can afford to give them twelve each. The rate of wages would for one year be twelve quarters ; but if the labourers produced no more than before, the farmers' savings will be exhausted in one year, and wages will sink to their former level. It is true that wages are paid out of previous accumulations, but they cannot permanently amount to more than is annually produced. If by increase of capital be meant increase of machinery, it should be stated whether the machines are

supposed to be such that by their use the men who make them, and those who use them, can together produce a greater quantity of corn than the same number of men all practising agriculture. If they can do this, then some discovery has been made which renders labour more efficient, and it would be more correct to say that wages have risen because labour is more efficient, than because capital has increased relatively to the number of labourers. In agriculture it is still a disputed question, whether the large capitalist using expensive machinery can undersell the peasant farmer using little or none; it seems therefore more likely that if farm-labourers receive more corn now than formerly, it is owing to the discovery of better modes of sowing, ploughing, or manuring, which could be employed as well in small as in large farms, rather than to the invention and manufacture of expensive machines. Great difficulties, however, stand in the way of such an increase of wages as will give the farm-labourer more of that article which constitutes the staple food of the people. It seems to have been accomplished in Yorkshire, but this is a district practically closed against the competition of labourers from other parts of the country, yet at the same time able to compete with them in the sale of its produce. The price of wheat is determined by the cost of its production in the least favourable circumstances, and it could not fall unless some discovery were made which should enable it to be produced with less cost in those places which at present determine its price. There would be great inducement to those who were the first to make the discovery to take advantage of it, by cultivating land which was formerly thought too poor, and selling the produce before the price had fallen. The process is greatly obscured by the vicissitudes of the seasons; but the fact that the average price of wheat in England during the whole of the eighteenth century differs by no more than fivepence from the average of the seventeenth century, encourages the belief that although the same quantity of labour exerted throughout the country now produces a much greater quantity of corn than formerly, nevertheless that portion of it which determines its price is raised with the same, or nearly the same, amount of labour. It may be, that at one period in the fifteenth century the English labourer could procure eleven quarters of wheat, and in another period in the seventeenth century only five quarters; but this difference is hardly greater than has been brought about within the last three or four years by the vicissitudes of the seasons. Wages vary according to the changes of the seasons—*i.e.*, money wages remain stationary while prices vary.

Lord Hailes, who wrote in the time of Charles II., computed that a labourer could not do with less than ten shillings a week,

and this is the rate given by McCulloch, in 1863, as the lowest prevailing in the country. Thus fact and theory concur to show that the cost of producing the staple article of food is not likely to experience any considerable permanent alteration. It will not become dearer, because people will not voluntarily submit to be deprived of comforts to which they are accustomed: it will not become cheaper, because an improvement will be followed by increase of population, or in some other way bring about increased consumption.

It is an error to suppose that the Corn Laws made corn dear. In reality they check population, and their repeal has enabled us to procure a much larger quantity at the same cost. The larger population thus produced, has given a great extension to our manufactories, and labourers have been benefited by the reduced cost of manufactured articles. With regard, however, to raw produce, other than the staple food of the people, the law holds good, that an increased demand necessitates the resorting to inferior soils, and thus raises the cost. This cause has undoubtedly raised the price of meat and dairy produce, and in this respect the labourer of the fifteenth century was perhaps better off than his descendant of the present time. I say *perhaps*, for it appears that in the reign of Henry VII. the Earl of Northumberland's household only ate fresh meat between Midsummer and Michaelmas, so that it is probable that the labourers were confined to salt meat during the greater part of the year, and they can now procure bacon. While therefore improvements in agriculture do not promise much chance of a rise of wages, improvements in all other branches of production must almost inevitably produce one. If a smith, working by himself, can make 200 nails a day, and if ten men by practising a judicious division of labour, can make 40,000 nails a day, twenty nails can in the latter case be made with as little labour as one in the former, and the value of each nail will be reduced to one-twentieth. Of this improvement, every labourer who cares to use nails would reap the benefit, since he could with the same proportion of his earnings obtain a greater quantity of nails, or the same quantity of them, and more of something else. It was not the Black Death, but the great expansion of manufactures and commerce, which produced the remarkable rise of wages in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The extension of the trade with Flanders enabled embroidered cloth and silk to be produced at a cheaper rate, and the labourers were able to use them, much to the scandal of the legislature. Since that time the innumerable improvements which have been introduced in our manufactories, have given the labourers the command of a greater quantity of cloth, as well as of many

other things which were then unknown equally to rich and poor. Adam Smith remarked, that while the price of corn and the rate of wages had remained stationary, manufactured articles had become cheaper, and he gave this as a proof that the condition of the people had improved, but he did not see that this improvement was the necessary result of the improvements introduced into our manufactories during the last century. To show the connexion, it is only necessary to point out that the value of commodities depends on the quantity of labour which is required to produce them, and that if those who produce them can do so with less labour than before, all other labourers would insist on only giving in exchange something which has cost them less labour. Thus it has been seen in the past, and will be seen in the future, that as society advances, the cost of the staple article of food remains stationary, while wages are subject to two opposite influences,—the increased cost of raw produce, which tends to make them fall, and manufacturing improvements which tend to make them rise. The question, whether on the whole wages rise or fall is one which will receive different answers according to the different importance which we may attach to meat and dairy produce, on the one hand, and to clothing and furniture on the other, as affecting the labourer's comfort. Even in comparing different countries in the present day, it is not easy to say in which of them wages are lower or higher. It has been frequently asserted that they are not higher in America than in England, and that the greater cheapness of corn is counterbalanced by the dearth of hardware and other articles, which cannot be produced there at a low price, and of which, distance and a protective tariff prevent the importation.

In this case there are two tests which may serve to decide the question:—first, English labourers emigrate to America, and secondly, when there, they accumulate considerable savings, which they seldom do here. But in comparing different ages, no equally satisfactory test can be applied, and there will perhaps always be men who will regret that the age has passed away when the labourer's table was so well supplied as it is said to have been in the fifteenth century. To those who look on intellectual culture as one of the highest ends which man is born to attain, the benefit of a cheap press will alone appear sufficient to counterbalance all the disadvantages to which the labourer is now subject, and from which he was formerly free.

There is one way in which the condition of the labourers may be materially improved, though without producing what can properly be termed a rise of wages. It is, to convert them into capitalists, and thus enable them to receive both wages and profit. A peasant working for himself, using his own plough, his

own horses, &c., will receive more than a man working for a farmer. It is true he will have to set aside a portion of his revenue to replace his tools and seed, to feed his cattle, &c., but after doing this, there will remain a profit which will compensate him for the sacrifice which he has made, while saving the money necessary to provide him with the stock which he requires. The hope of receiving this profit induces him to make further savings, and to work harder, so that his reward is increased not by his labour being rendered more productive, but by his being induced to exert more labour. It is as well here to notice an objection which may be urged against the foregoing argument: It may be said, that it assumes the rate of profit to be uniform, whereas the rate varies, and the capitalist may appropriate to himself the benefit of an improvement; it is replied that no sufficient proof has yet been given, that the rate of profit is really different in different ages or countries. Farming profit would seem to be, as above stated, the difference between the receipts of a peasant working for himself, and of a labourer working for a master, and the rate of profit, to be the proportion which that sum bears to the value of the stock employed by the farmer. Why this rate should be different in different ages or countries is not clear, but at all events the variations are too slight to have much effect upon prices, and the rate is said to be highest in America and Australia, where wages are also highest, so that if it produces any effect, it is not sufficient to counter-balance the advantages of the labourer's position in those countries. To return from this digression,—the most remarkable instance of a great improvement in the labourer's condition was exhibited in France, when the revolutionary government enabled the peasants to acquire possession of the land, and thus converted them into capitalists. The best attested instances of a deterioration were afforded in England, when the gentry, by the enclosure of commons, or by the conversion of arable land into pasture, deprived the poor of the means of maintaining cattle, or turned them out of their homes, and left them to starve or to get employment as hired labourers. These instances, which were common in the sixteenth century, did not lower the wages of those who could get employment, but filled the country with crowds of men who could get none when they had lost the only one for which they were fit. For an improvement in the lot of our peasants we should look to legislation, which will do for them, what has been already done in France and Prussia. For an improvement in that of other labourers, we must look to mechanical inventions, improved locomotion, reduction of taxation, and other changes which will reduce the cost of the articles which they use, or may hereafter

use. In no case ought we to look to a rise of money wages, which would only be brought about either by some improvement in the production of gold, or by some alteration in our commercial relations with the gold countries, and would in neither case confer a permanent benefit on the labourers.

Although no economist has, so far as I am aware,\* explained the variations of wages by saying that they depend on the efficiency of labour, I am yet able to cite high authorities in support of this theory. It is an extension, to all states of society, of the principle laid down by Adam Smith, as prevailing in primitive times, with the slight modification, that the rate of wages is determined by the efficiency of labour in the least favourable circumstances in which it is exerted. Adam Smith could not give it this extension, because the nature of rent had not in his time been explained. Had this been done, he would doubtless have said that the farm-labourer receives as much corn as he could produce on the worst land in cultivation. The same circumstance prevented him from extending his theory of value to all states of society, but it is singular that Ricardo, who effected this extension, should not have done the same to the theory of wages, for it would then have been in fact, identical with his theory of value. Ricardo contends that if it requires twice as much labour to chase and kill a deer as a beaver, one deer will exchange for two beavers. Why? Because it is only in that way that the labour of the two hunters will be equally rewarded, because in that way the deer hunter will be able to procure as many beavers as he could catch for himself, and the beaver hunter, as many deer. What is this, but saying that wages depend on the efficiency of labour? If an improvement takes place in the manufacture of shoes, Ricardo considers that the value of shoes will fall. Why? Because if it did not, the shoemaker would be able to procure more shoes than other labourers, by the same quantity of labour. How can it be contended at the same time, that the value of shoes will fall, in order that the carpenter might procure a pair, by the expenditure of less labour, and that nevertheless the carpenter would not be able to purchase more shoes with his wages? Ricardo, indeed, seems to have felt the force of these arguments, for he seems to consider that a rise of wages would be the immediate consequence of an improvement in production, but he supposes that increase of

---

\* Since writing this, I have been much gratified to find the principle recognised by Mr. Jevons, in his "Theory of Political Economy," Macmillan, 1871, where he quotes a passage from Mr. Hearn's "Plutology," in which it is also admitted; but this latter work I have not yet met with.

population would soon deprive the labourers of the advantage. It is difficult to see on what grounds he asserted, that though the cost of producing corn was much less in America and Poland than in England, nevertheless the labourers in those countries did not receive more corn.

Although Senior, in his Manual, has given as an explanation of the rate of wages, the palpable truism before mentioned, he has, in a lecture on the cost of obtaining money, given a more rational explanation of the rates of wages measured in silver, prevailing in different countries. After mentioning the quantity of silver annually received by the labourers in England, India, and the United States, he explains the difference, not by saying that the fund of silver to be distributed among them is, in proportion to their number, greatest in the United States, and smallest in India, but by pointing out that the labour of the Hindoo is the least efficient of all, and that he receives the least silver, because he is the least able to produce articles which can be sent to Mexico in exchange for silver. Another high authority, Mr. Cairnes, has at least on one occasion assumed the truth of the principle. In an interesting account of the effects produced in Australia by the discovery of gold in 1851,\* he tells us that it was soon found, that an ordinary labourer, with a pickaxe and a few other tools, could, on the average, obtain one quarter of an ounce of gold in a day. A quarter of an ounce is worth about twenty shillings, and he says that, consequently, wages in all employments rose, until every man received either twenty shillings a day, or so much more or less as counterbalanced the disadvantages or advantages of his employment, compared with that of the gold-digger. Thus, when the efficiency of the miner's labour was increased, wages, estimated in gold, rose in proportion. He further tells us that, when the surface deposits were exhausted, and the miners, consequently, were only able to obtain half as much gold as before in a day, the general rate of wages fell to ten shillings per day. Now it is clear that the same argument must apply equally to other commodities besides gold. If the Australian shepherd can insist on having more gold, because the miner can produce more, the miner must be equally able to obtain more wool, or mutton, if the discovery of fresh pastures enables the shepherd to produce more. Passages might be cited from other writers, in which this principle is either stated or implied, but these references will suffice to show that it is not put forward without good authority to back it.

Readers who are familiar with Adam Smith, will see that it is

---

\* "Essay towards the Solution of the Gold Question." *Fraser's Magazine*, September, 1859.

but another form of the theory which he laid down respecting value—viz., “The value of any commodity to the person who possesses it, and who means not to use or consume it himself, but to exchange it for other commodities, is equal to the quantity of labour which it enables him to purchase or command. Labour, therefore, is the real measure of the exchangeable value of all commodities.” The opinion here expressed is thought to have been exploded. Ricardo contends that labour is not a good measure of value, because the labourer receives the same quantity of food and necessaries, whether they are cheap or dear. He supposes a case in which the cost of producing corn is doubled, from increase of population, or some other cause, and he says:—

“If the labourer’s wages at the former period were a certain quantity of food and necessaries, he probably could not have subsisted if that quantity had been reduced. Food and necessaries will, in this case, have risen 100 per cent., if estimated by the quantity of labour necessary to their production, while they will scarcely have increased in value if measured by the quantity of labour for which they will exchange.”

In this passage Ricardo commits the error of supposing that because a labourer *eats* much the same quantity of bread, whether it be cheap or dear, therefore he can *buy* much the same quantity *with the whole of his wages*. Any workman would have told him that he was obliged to spend a greater proportion of his wages in buying bread when the price had risen after a bad harvest, or in other words, when labour was less productive. Suppose that in Ricardo’s example each labourer could raise four quarters of wheat;—he would receive four quarters, and if he required two for his own consumption he would obtain them in exchange for half his labour, and would be able to spend the other half on other things. Now suppose the change takes place, and each labourer produces only two quarters:—he will still procure two, but he will have to give in exchange for them, the whole of his labour, and will have nothing to spend on other things. If it becomes still more difficult to raise corn, and one man can only produce one and a half quarters, being too little to support life, a famine will soon follow, and the country will be depopulated, for it is impossible that labourers should continue to consume more than they produce. It is true that there is a minimum, below which labour ceases to act as a measure of value, but this minimum is only reached with the extinction of society, and labour and value perish together. Ricardo has been here cited and criticised, not with any intention of detracting from the merits of his great work, but because he thought out the argument, which others have merely copied. But attentive perusal of what he has written on this head makes it



evident that he, the greatest and clearest thinker who has ever investigated economic science, had but a dim conception of what he meant by the phrase, "purchase of labour." This phrase and the kindred one "price of labour," are very objectionable, having a great tendency to create confusion. We measure commodities, not against labour, but labour against commodities. It is for the interest of mankind that commodities should be cheap, that is, that men should be able to procure them with little exertion. We justly consider it an advantage to America, that corn is there cheap, and an advantage to Newcastle that coal is cheap. But if we use the expression "cheap labour," the mind is naturally led to suppose that this too is an advantage to a country. There cannot be a greater mistake; labour is cheap when the labourer receives little to reward him for his toil, and what diminishes the comforts of the great majority of the people, ought not to be considered as a benefit to the country. Yet a great deal of reasoning on the subject of emigration, is based on the assumption that cheap labour is a benefit. Even so judicious and unprejudiced a writer as Mr. Herman Merivale, recommends the English Government to encourage the emigration of free labourers into Demerara and Trinidad, on the ground that it would "bring down the enormous rate of wages by fair competition.\*" Now wages are high in Demerara because there is an immense supply of unoccupied, fertile land, and the labourers do not work for less wages than they can produce for themselves. However large the number of the emigrants, they would not bring down wages by fair competition, so long as there remained an abundant supply of land as good as at present. If they came in such numbers as to render it necessary to resort to inferior lands, then, indeed, wages would fall; but who would be benefited? Not the labourers, for they would be worse off—nor yet the capitalists, as a body, for though they would pay less, their workmen would produce less. Only those persons would benefit, who possessed the superior lands, that is, either landlords, or a few capitalists, at all events an insignificant portion of the people. In fact, colonial capitalists know that it is useless to expect that European labourers will reduce wages by mutual competition. It is for this reason that they import Africans or Asiatics, who are prevented by their ignorance of the language, and of the country, from either setting up on their own account, or from knowing what they could get if they did so. As a further security, their employers take care to bind them to work for five years, or some other long period, and thus fix a lower rate of wages than would be established by "fair competition;" that is, that state of things

---

\* "Lectures on Colonization and Colonies." New edition. 1861. Page 318.

in which the labourer is able to choose between the comparative advantage of working for himself and working for a master. When we remember the important post formerly occupied by Mr. Merivale, we may reasonably suppose that his opinion has had great weight in inducing the Government to introduce coolies into our colonies. The system is merely advantageous to a few capitalists; whatever they gain is lost by the coolies. It is not of course a mere intellectual error which has caused its introduction. So long as our colonies submit to our rule, their interests will be sacrificed to the interests, real or supposed, of the governing classes in the mother country. The Government of the United States, carried on by the people, and for the people, has never lavished its resources on importing emigrants for the unattainable object of making labour cheap. It is to be hoped that that Government will refuse to enforce any contracts by which a coolie binds himself to serve a master for more than a few months. The labourers of South Australia refuse to tax themselves in order to bring over emigrants to swell the capitalist's profit. But when a young country is governed, not by its own inhabitants, but by rulers at a distance of many thousand miles, economic fallacies have a great effect in hindering its prosperity, and there would have been fewer persons in favour of supplying the colonies with slaves, convicts, and coolies, if it had been clearly understood that dearness of labour is the greatest benefit to the mass of the people, and it proceeds not from the small number of labourers, but from the fertility of the soil.

"Increase of population" has always been put forward as the great obstacle to all improvement in the condition of the people. Any one who is acquainted with what has been written on the subject, knows that when once the phrase has run off the pen, the subject is thought to be exhausted, and no trouble is taken to show that it will have the effect of lowering wages, or any effect at all. It is worthy of note that the professed followers of Malthus, and even he himself, have used his theory to prove the very thing which it was his object to disprove.

Before his time, it was commonly supposed that to increase the number of births was to increase population. He proved that this was not so—that population depended on the supply of food—and that increase of births, beyond what is necessary to keep up the population, would only be followed by an increase of deaths. Yet it is constantly repeated that a rise of wages weakens the labourer's motives to practise restraint, increases the number of births, and thereby population. It has been shown above, in discussing the case of Yorkshire, that an increase of population, exactly proportioned to the increase of food, may leave wages at a higher level than before. But it is

true that, speaking generally, an agricultural improvement increases the quantity of food, but does not lower the cost. Thus after the change has taken place, people are obliged to spend the same proportion of their wages in the purchase of food, and, as far as this goes, are no better off than before. But it is otherwise when an improvement takes place in any other branch of industry. If some discovery is made, which enables a tailor to produce two coats with as little labour as one formerly required, the value of the coat will be half what it was before. The increased demand for coats will not raise their value, but is rather likely to lower it. If increase of population deprives the labourers of the benefit, it can only be by raising the cost of something else. This something cannot be food, because even if fewer men were required in the tailor's trade, those who were turned off would not cultivate poorer land in order to grow food for unborn persons, when, by working at some new trade, they could obtain for themselves the produce of better land. Mr. Rogers argues, and his tables seem to show, that in point of fact, corn does not become dearer as the country becomes more populous. If we take the instance of the repeal of the paper duty, we find that the price of newspapers was thereby reduced from 2*d.* to 1*d.*, but that the increase of population, which has since taken place, has not raised the price again, but that on the contrary, one newspaper, which has a large circulation, is sold for a halfpenny. Neither has it raised the price of corn, and if it is true that it has lowered wages, it must have been by raising that of butchers' meat or other raw produce. But it cannot be taken for granted, that the improvement in one direction will be counterbalanced by a falling off in another. Certainly the cheapening of newspapers has no tendency to increase population. One portion of truth in the theory that population determines wages, is, that a man who has several children unable to work, is unable to spend so much on his own comfort as one who has none. Malthus accordingly, at least in his latest edition, only put forward his principle as a rule for the guidance of individuals, whom he advised not to marry until they were able to maintain a family in what they deemed sufficient comfort. It is also true that if, after a plentiful harvest more children are born than can be supported, when a bad season returns, much distress will then ensue, but wages will then be lower, not because population has increased, but because men are not able to obtain so much from the earth. What is called "over population," results rather from the fluctuations of commerce, which so frequently deprive men of the employment to which they are accustomed, than from any imprudence on the part of parents. It is impossible that any prudence should

foresee all the vicissitudes of the seasons, and it is to these that many of the fluctuations of industry, and even some of those great ones which are called commercial crises, are due. Similar effects are produced in all countries, though they do not appear in the same form. In poor countries a bad harvest produces a famine, and thousands perish from starvation : in more civilized countries it produces a disturbance in trade, and throws many out of employment, leaving them to be supported by private or public charity. The only palliations for this evil are, such an education as will enable men to turn easily from one employment to another, and emigration to more favoured lands. Lastly, it is true that a great diminution of population may raise wages. Such was the immediate effect of the depopulation produced by the Black Death. The reason probably was, that a great deal of land was thrown out of cultivation by the want of hands to till it. Those labourers, therefore, who were willing to work for hire, only worked on the superior lands, and received more because they produced more. But the Black Death cannot be made to account for the fact that wages continued to rise for more than a century afterwards, which must be explained as above, by the general industrial progress of the country.

I have now endeavoured, I hope successfully, to prove by *à priori* reasoning, that wages must be determined by the efficiency of labour, by appealing to history and to existing facts that they are so determined, and by reference to several writers that the theory is a necessary deduction from principles laid down by the thinkers who have thrown most light on economic science. Some may think the inquiry of little importance, but none can do so who wish to unravel the laws which govern the growth of society. Mr. Thornton has rendered us an immense service by letting us out of the "mill-horse circle," in which we were condemned to wander while believing that wages could not rise unless labourers restrained their powers of self-multiplication, and that they could not practise restraint unless wages rose. I have endeavoured to show that as society advances labourers must acquire a greater command over many important articles, although they live in utter defiance of Malthusian principles. In conclusion, I must remind the reader that the theory does not profess to explain all cases, but only the general average rate prevailing in a country. It is something if science can explain the trade winds, though it cannot predict every breeze that is sufficient to turn our weathercocks.

## CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

*The Foreign Books noticed in the following sections are chiefly supplied by Messrs. WILLIAMS & NORGATE, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, and Mr. NUTT, 270, Strand.*

## THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY.

THE volume of lectures on scepticism delivered in public to approving audiences, proceeds from nine clergymen, a Congregationalist minister, and a Wesleyan.<sup>1</sup> The subjects are very different, but have all one tendency and object—the maintenance of the truth of the Christian religion. What is the Christian religion? This the lecturers do not distinctly describe or define, though it is the first thing they ought to have set forth, forming the text of all their discussion. Arguments have no value as long as they deal vaguely with Christianity and its doctrines. It is evident from the volume that the authors consider it the one system taught in the first three gospels by Christ himself, propounded by St. John in the fourth gospel, and by St. Paul in his epistles; whereas there are three different phases presented in the New Testament books, the original Judaic phase, the Pauline, and the Johannine: varied types of doctrine, each with marked features of its own. In like manner they should have furnished proof of the Synoptic gospels having proceeded from the evangelists whose names they bear; whereas they have taken it for granted, leading their readers to suppose that all the words and actions attributed to Jesus in those documents were really spoken and done by him. The great problem of New Testament criticism at present, is to separate what truly belongs to Jesus, from the adventitious elements and distorted reports presented by the gospels. The reverend lecturers have merely *assumed* weighty propositions at the outset, and argued upon them as a basis. If, however, the Christian Evidence Society and its champions wish to do something effective, their first object should be to show the genuineness and authenticity of the New Testament books; else their cause is not promoted. The general characteristic of the Essays is vague statement, loose argumentation, and feeble reasoning. They bear little evidence of intellectual ability, original thought, comprehensive and accurate knowledge, or conclusive argument. The majority of them scarcely rise above the level of commonplace; and some proceed from persons unable to grasp or discuss their subjects with clearness or caution. A few are fair specimens of reasoning, candid and judicious, such as the Archbishop of York's on "Design in Nature," which is very good. That on "Positivism" shows a fair acquaintance with Comte's system, and a perception of its serious defects. Mr. Jackson possesses vigour of mind and mastery of his subject. The explanatory paper at

<sup>1</sup> "Modern Scepticism. A Course of Lectures delivered at the request of the Christian Evidence Society, with an Explanatory Paper by the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol." London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1871.

the end is sober, clear, and temperate. The lecture on Pantheism is feeble, wordy, and pretentious. Though the author describes his qualifications for discussing the topic, he is plainly incompetent to its examination. The Dean of Canterbury on science and revelation advances nothing novel or important. The Bishop of Carlisle on the gradual development of revelation is disappointing and tame. He does not perceive the weakness of Butler's argument from analogy applied to a written revelation. The fifth, on the miraculous testimony to Christianity, is especially poor, showing an incapacity for the elucidation of a difficult subject. It is plentifully interspersed with wrong statements, and has a rhetorical style singularly out of place. Those on the mythical theories of the Gospels, and on Christ's teaching and influence on the world, are also examples of weak and loose reasoning. Nor is the closing lecture much better "On the Completeness and Adequacy of the Evidences of Christianity." If assertions were proofs, these lectures would be successful. The volume is far below the standard of excellence. How can sceptics be persuaded by such preaching as this: "The first great cluster of Bible wonders we find gathered round the Lawgiver of Israel; the second round the great Reformer of God's ancient Church; the third round Him who is spoken of as the Word made flesh, who dwelt among us, and who imparted to His Apostles miraculous powers akin to his own. Miracles, for the most part, are halos of divine light encircling three grand names, Moses, Elijah, Jesus, the last the greatest of the three?"

Mr. Hunt continues in this volume the chapters begun in his first in a similar spirit, style, and method.<sup>2</sup> He has perused the works of the leading divines, of which he gives an account more or less extended, with commendable industry, extracting their pith, and showing their bearing with general fairness. The volume completes the seventeenth century, with the addition of the chief part of the deistical controversy. It contains an instructive but sad history. Useless controversies, uncharitableness in divines, a persecuting spirit, appear, so that Christianity is almost lost to view amid the jarrings of its professors. Notwithstanding the remarks of the author in the preface, the want of dates is a serious defect in his book. So is the absence of more references to works and their pages. It is fortunate that Mr. Hunt indulges but seldom in remarks of his own; for he has little philosophical talent, and his theology is superficial. Where he does give his opinions, he is often right and often wrong. Nor is he always minutely accurate. Thus he says, that the argument of Leslie the nonjuror, demonstrating that if the Trinity is a contradiction it must be divine, is "most excellent." Of Jeremiah Jones, Mr. Hunt is pleased to say, that he had not a clear idea in his own mind of what he meant by the canon of the New Testament; which is incorrect. Of course we are not told that he was a Dissenter, or that his work appeared in 1726 after his death, the preface dated from "the Poultry."

---

<sup>2</sup> "Religious Thought in England from the Reformation to the End of last Century: a Contribution to the History of Theology." By Rev. John Hunt, M.A. Vol. ii. London: Strahan. 1871.

It is plain too that our author does not see the invalidity of Bishop Chandler's answer to Collins on prophecy, or the weakness of the basis from which the latter argued. The volume is interesting because it reviews so many men of note and their works. As such it is a valuable contribution to the history of religion in England during the seventeenth century. But the author writes too hastily to be unhesitatingly relied on. His composition is also awkward at times, as, "The former were the sincere defenders of the Divine right of Episcopacy *that they have been* since the time of Laud."

We are glad to see another instalment in English of "Ewald's History of Israel,"<sup>3</sup> a work so well known in Germany, and in England too, by all critical scholars who study the Old Testament, as to need no description. The two volumes, edited by a different person from him that superintended the first two, begin with the foundation of monarchy in Israel, and terminate with its fall, so that they describe an eventful period, with a most important literature. David and Solomon; the disruption of David's kingdom; prophetism and its representatives, Elijah and his successors; the reformation under Josiah; the causes that led to the destruction of Judah, are traced with that high critical sagacity and poetic insight which Ewald eminently possesses. The German volume which is here divided into two, is one of great value to the student of ancient history. If we cannot adopt the various hypotheses of the Göttingen Professor, and he certainly divides the original accounts among too many narrators, we can appreciate the ability with which he weaves an intelligible web of history out of the scattered materials and fragmentary notices in the Biblical books. If his conjectures be sometimes improbable, and his mode of representation too subjective, we feel the hand of a master leading through paths often perplexed, where the light of truth shines dimly amid the legends that obscure it or the exaggerations of later narrators looking back upon the past times of their nation with longing regrets. The German critic is peculiarly happy in his treatment of the old prophets, with whom he has great sympathy in their noble struggles against kingly oppression and wrong. Hence his picture of Elijah is a very vivid one. So is that of Isaiah. A great part of the third volume is occupied with the life and reign of David, to whom he renders full justice and something more. Perhaps he idealizes this great king to a certain extent, passing slightly over his dying counsels to Solomon, which cannot be justified by any hypothesis of state policy or regal caution. The translation is very good. It is free, as it should be, for the style of the original is rugged and could not be rendered literally into English without harshness. We have generally found that the sense is reproduced in clear and readable sentences. Sometimes indeed the strength of the German is a little enfeebled by paraphrase; but it is hard to avoid that defect. A short extract will give an idea both of Ewald's narrative and the present version.

"The circumstances of the state prevented any power but the prophetic from

\* 3 "The History of Israel." By H. Ewald, translated from the German. Edited by J. Estlin Carpenter, M.A. Vols. III. & IV. London: Longman & Co. 1871.

being strong enough to counterbalance the power of the crown; fortunately, however, there was then alive, in the person of Isaiah, the greatest prophet who ever appeared in ancient Jerusalem. In him the spiritualized prophetism peculiar to this age, and especially to the kingdom of Judah, assumed the most pure and perfect form, so far as regards the power of language of equal force and beauty, the strength of its influence, and its outward success. His ministry is not free from the ancient vehemence and the inflexible pretension originally inherent in all prophetic activity; but with it the spirit is struggling to make clear the truth in its purity and freedom. His utterance alights with equal severity on the perverseness of men of all sorts, the king and the chief officers of state, as well as the people, false prophets, and accommodating priests; but he has no desire to destroy the human monarchy, or the house of David, even where it grievously errs; it is only on the certain approach of the consummation of every thing human in the glorified kingdom of God and in the true king, that his inspired glance is directed, it is this alone which lives hidden in his own heart; and when he turns from its bright picture and is obliged to discern and to proclaim that no existing kingdom, neither Assyria nor Judah, can exist before it, he yet acts on every present opportunity as though at any rate the eternal law and the impulse of this coming consummation must even then prevail to change everything for good."—Vol. iv. p. 168.

The title of Mr. Gribble's pamphlet<sup>4</sup> is taken from a passage in one of Prof. Huxley's addresses or lay-sermons, where he speaks of the cosmogony of the semi-barbarous Hebrew, and of extinguished theologians lying about the cradle of every science as the strangled snakes beside that of Hercules; and the object of the essay is to defend the cosmogony of the Hebrews given in Genesis, as well as to claim for the theologian a fair hearing. The author deals in assertions which are neither precise nor correct, and upholds the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch on grounds that will not bear examination, and have been already disposed of. The latter portion of the essay is better than the first; though it is somewhat vague and superficial. The note at the end animadvertes on Dr. Kalisch's view of the late origin of Leviticus with some plausibility, but in an unscholarly fashion. The entire value of the pamphlet is very small; and Prof. Huxley is substantially right. It is surely too late in the day to quote Smith's Bible Dictionary in favour of the Pentateuch's Mosaic authorship; or to affirm that there are men as learned who uphold that view as those who deny it—an assertion notoriously false. Most readers will think that a man who believes the epic poem in Exodus xv. to have been composed and sung on the shores of the Red Sea, is not entitled to write about the authorship of the Pentateuch or the Davidic Psalms.

The origin and growth of the Messianic idea among the Jews is a topic intimately connected with the history of that ancient people, and to some extent with the early records in the New Testament that present Jesus of Nazareth as the reformer of the national religion.<sup>5</sup> Its proper treatment requires a thorough acquaintance with the Hebrew Scriptures, especially the prophetic books; a critical knowledge

<sup>4</sup> "The Semi-barbarous Hebrew and the Extinguished Theologian." An essay by Thomas Gribble. London: Longman & Co. 1871.

<sup>5</sup> "Ecce Messias; or the Hebrew Messianic Hope and the Christian Reality." By Ed. Higginson. London: Williams & Norgate. 1871.



of the Gospels; familiarity with the apocryphal writings commonly assigned to Jewish authorship, during the two centuries prior to Christ and the first century of the Christian era; with an adequate appreciation of the best literature which the subject has created in modern times. It involves the serious question which Jews still urge against Christianity, viz., that Jesus was not the Messiah predicted in the Old Testament, but a personage different from the hoped-for deliverer to whom the eye was especially directed in times of national distress. This is the subject discussed by Mr. Higginson, who undertakes to answer the questions, "What was the Jewish expectation as shown in the Old Testament, and the Christian realization in the New?" and, "Is the Christ of history an adequate fulfilment of the Hebrew hope?" The whole is treated under two heads, the Messiah of the Jews, and the Messiah of Christian acceptance. The volume is somewhat disappointing, because the author does not examine the theme with a fair knowledge of all that it involves, or in the best style and manner. He is either ignorant of the most recent literature connected with the Messianic idea, or has no regard to it. Nor does he think correctly or express his ideas with precision. On the contrary, his notions are perfunctory and vague; his language diffuse. The materials are not well arranged; and collateral topics are drawn in which increase the bulk of the book without adding to its value. That he has a few good general ideas on the theme is obvious. Nor can it be denied that he has written with preparation for his task. Indeed he tells the reader that he has put into writing the mature thoughts of many years. But he should have revised and remoulded these thoughts by the light of recent literature; after which he might have produced a better book. As it is, he has contributed nothing to the elucidation of the subject in issuing a work that does not even reflect the latest and best thoughts of biblical critics on it. His mind is essentially superficial, without power or acuteness. While he appears to be a man of reading and reflection, his reading is narrow in range, and his reflections feeble. A good deal depends on the chronological arrangement of the books of the Bible, towards a right development of the Messianic idea. Here Mr. Higginson's arrangement is not always correct. Following, as he does, Archbishop Newcome, Dr. Noyes, and especially Dr. R. Williams, he must fall into mistakes. The "Introductions to the Old Testament," by Davidson and Bleek, Ewald's "History of Israel," and other books of the same kind are ignored. Nor is he better acquainted with the literature of the New Testament; where he is satisfied with the chronological arrangement of St. Paul's epistles by Conybeare and Howson. Of "Davidson's Introduction," "Keim's Geschichte Jesu," Scheinkel's books, those of Baur, Zeller, Hilgenfeld, Weizsäcker, Hausrath, and others, he is unconscious. The volume contains large passages of the prophetic and other writings translated somewhat differently from the received version. These are unnecessarily numerous; the eclectic translation being often incorrect. It is a curious fact that the writer does not note distinctly the time when the Messianic idea originated, which could not have been till the rise of monarchy. Nor does he trace its gradual growth with any true

perception of the fluctuations it underwent. Why he should have presented discussions about the books of Ecclesiastes and the Apocalypse, the former of which he does not understand; and why he should have supposed that David wrote Messianic psalms, it is hard to conceive. The looseness of his reasoning may be judged of by the fact, that he speaks of the Messianic *belief* equally with the Messianic *hope*, and does not distinguish between the nation generally and the foremost spirits in it, such as the prophets. As to the difficult point, when did the conception of his Messianic dignity arise in the mind of Jesus—was it there at the very beginning, or was it the growth of time—Mr. Higginson does not seem aware of its existence, or of the acute discussions of critics respecting it, but simply assumes that it was in the mind of Christ at the commencement of His ministry. We regret that the work is an unsatisfactory guide, bearing few traces either of the good scholar or correct thinker.

It is of little importance whether the conversations and discussions in this volume be faithful reports of debates really held, or the offspring of a single mind.\* According to the Introduction, the scene of them was at Canterbury, at the Editor's house. The speaker Basil, is a Ritualistic clergyman, Max and Leonard are honest searchers after a creed, the former now in the Civil Service, the latter at the Bar; while the Editor himself, representing the old-fashioned churchman of fifty years ago, is a man of fortune. The topics that come under discussion are essentially connected with man's highest welfare. Faith, reason, dogma, creed, conscience, the Church, miracles, the canon of Scripture, inspiration, the person of Jesus Christ, and other matters related to these, are passed in review. The speakers present them in different aspects, advancing arguments for their respective opinions which have satisfied many minds. The first dialogue is occupied with three propositions—Religion is essentially dogmatic, Salvation is dependent on the belief of certain dogmas, and God has given man an infallible guide to essential dogmatic truth. These resolve themselves into a search after the infallible guide in religion, which is easily recognised by two infallible signs—a plain, undoubted profession of infallibility, and accessibleness as a referee to decide all questions arising from time to time as to what is or is not essential dogmatic truth. After this, the three guides on behalf of which infallibility is claimed are considered. The Bible as viewed by Protestants, the Church as defined by Anglo-Catholics, and the Church of Rome. The second dialogue shows that the Church of the Anglo-Catholics does not satisfy the conditions, but that the Church of Rome does, notwithstanding the argument of "Janus." After the debate on an infallible guide, another topic is started—viz., that religion is essentially undogmatic. Here dogma is defined, and the nature of Christ's teaching shown to be undogmatic, contrary to Dr. Liddon's opinion. The third dialogue treats of faith and its basis, the dis-

---

\* "Authority and Conscience: a Free Debate on the Tendency of Dogmatic Theology, and on the Characteristics of Faith." Edited by Conway Morel. London: Longman and Co. 1871.

tion of faiths and dogmas, the moral sense which pronounces on the relative worth of the various principles of human action, and the conscious subordination of dogmatic belief to the faiths that rest on an intuitive basis. The fourth dialogue handles religion under the alleged view of its governing every part of man's nature, the supposed unsocialness of the religious views which are based on man's deepest nature, and the extension of inspiration to other books besides the Bible. In the fifth and last, the evidential value of miracles, the fanatical tendencies of conscience, the image of Christ underlying all that Christianity has done, different views of His nature, the Doctrine of the Atonement, and the practice of modern missionaries as contrasted with that of Christ, come under review. The general drift of the treatise is to prove that religion is independent of dogma, consisting in an exclusive submission to the guidance of that good principle or faculty within us which is popularly called conscience, including the moral sense; in other words, that the knowledge and love of God, which constitute religion, are developed by a purely spiritual process, by a life of self-sacrifice and holiness. This is admirably shown, chiefly by the speaker called Max, who defends "religion" against all plausible objections and describes its high value compared with the dogmas embodied in the creeds of churches. It is refreshing to meet with a book in which sound reasoning, right principles, just views of God and man, the nature and fruits of true religion, are set forth with ability, precision, and candour. The author or authors possess a wide knowledge, and adduce it with a clear logic which is far from common. What they touch they illustrate. The views intended to be inculcated appear to be correct. Religion is not a belief of certain dogmas; it is an essential part of our subjective nature, the teaching of conscience, to obey which is to find God. It is impossible to give an adequate idea of the varied contents of the volume, which is eminently fitted to guide the earnest seeker after truth, to show him the real character of Christ's teaching, overlaid as it has been with the dogmas of theologians, and to elevate his moral nature. Orthodox views of the Bible are refuted, and its inspiration rationally treated. The style is excellent, expressing the ideas intended to be conveyed in appropriate language, sometimes rising into true eloquence. All who wish for instruction in the momentous themes relating to man as an accountable being placed here under a moral Governor in a state of probation; all who are disgusted with the bigotry engendered by church dogmas, and who long for peace; all thoughtful men pondering on the problems of life and death, anxious about their relation to God and their present duties to Him, should peruse the excellent book before us, which will direct them aright and settle distracting doubts.

Mr. Lynch was a man of fine gifts.<sup>7</sup> The style of his preaching was original. With a poetic imagination and cultivated intellect he descanted on Bible subjects pleasantly and profitably to the few that gathered together to hear his musings. He did not expound texts or preach doctrines, but enforced practical and pure ethics based upon or

---

<sup>7</sup> "Sermons for my Curates." By the late T. T. Lynch. Edited by S. Cox. London: Strahan and Co. 1871.

deduced from Scripture, with much felicity and beauty. What he excelled in was wealth of illustration. His discourses were subjective and spiritualistic, made up of analogies and correspondences, so that he seemed to be a semi-Swedenborgian. Amid pain and anguish the sermons in the present volume, with the accompanying prayers, were written out, to be read by one of his congregation to the rest on Sunday evenings. They will repay perusal, as the effusions of a noble and manly spirit, whose life was a beautiful specimen of that self-sacrifice which is the highest offering of man to God.

"*Lectures on Church Difficulties*" treat of various subjects connected with the position of a clergyman belonging to the Church of England at the present day.<sup>8</sup> They contain suggestions on practical difficulties, as well as theoretical views, which the late Dr. Neale considered of some importance. The well-known ritualistic sentiments of their author point and tinge them, so that churchmen not of his party will probably dissent from the majority of the views he advocates. The questions raised have all more sides than one; but they are looked at here from a single standpoint. An intelligent Anglo-Catholic clergyman gives forth ideas which will probably be rejected by others. The subjects are such as church unions, Christian marriage, baptismal grace, confirmation, confession, sermons, &c., which are treated rather in the light of church history and the formularies of the English Establishment, than in that of Scripture. His weak point is the interpretation of the Bible, as is shown in the *Lecture on Baptismal Grace*, where the 72nd Psalm is misapprehended throughout, and assigned to a wrong author, David. There are some good remarks in the *Lecture on Sermons*; but those on confirmation, confession, and on the laity sitting in convocation are not pervaded by much wisdom or correct thinking. If the Established Church were such as Dr. Neale would have her to be, she would be a sister of the Romish, very like the latter in doctrine and forms, not less despotic as far as she had power, and discouraging the right of private judgment as far as possible. Mr. Bennett's Introduction touches on a number of questions with characteristic plainness, dealing out some blows to bishops and other church dignitaries who will not do as the Anglicans wish. His opinions of heresy and schism proceed from a narrow mind which religion has not imbued with divine charity.

"*Views of the Deity*"<sup>9</sup> begins with the Vedic picture of God, and describes the God of Israel, God the Father of mankind, the Trinity, the Roman Catholic divinity; after which scientific teachings concerning the Deity are carefully unfolded step by step, so that the theologian may be led on without offence to his cherished notions to perceive and accept the latter. The purpose of the author is good and laudable—viz., to show a substantial harmony between the revelations of God in tradition and science. The second or scientific part is superior to the first. The various chapters on physical and vital force, the action of God's forces in

<sup>8</sup> "*Lectures on Church Difficulties.*" By the Rev. J. M. Neale, M.A. With Introduction by Rev. W. J. E. Bennett. Hayes.

<sup>9</sup> "*Views of the Deity, Traditional and Scientific: a Contribution to the Study of Theological Science.*" By James Samuelson. London: Williams and Norgate. 1871.

nature, the designs and perfection of God in nature, contain a clear statement of results reached by modern science, and should be convincing to every unbiassed mind. The last chapter endeavours to set forth the more prominent and coincident features of the divine Being in tradition and science, which make up a real image of Him. Here the deficiency of science appears, which can go no farther than the apprehending of one great Creator and Ruler, all-powerful, wise, and good, without knowledge of His mercy and love, so that tradition must supplement science. The contents of the chapters on the God of Israel and God the Father of mankind are not so well arranged as they might have been; and the development of the image of Deity as it was seen by the Hebrew mind at successive stages of the national culture, should have been more systematically traced. Thus the views of the Deity, as he is depicted by the later prophets, by John the Baptist, and by Jesus of Nazareth, as the Father of mankind, are considerably different. Mr. Samuelson is wrong in attributing to these prophets the belief in an immortal state; and we know too little of John the Baptist's views to class them with those of Christ in respect to the Almighty Parent. But the book is an excellent one, fitted to instruct theologians and to widen their views. The author's spirit is liberal. Would that divines were always as calm and rational!

Mr. Strange's little book<sup>10</sup> is intended to expose the weakness of the orthodox interpretations contained in the Commentary on the Pentateuch lately issued by Church of England divines. It is written in a free style, bold, dashing, plain, sometimes irreverent, and tolerably dogmatic. The first part is the best, noticing a number of admissions, evasions, and suppositions on the part of the commentators which seriously damage their cause. The mock-trial scene in the form of a law court's proceedings is intended to show that Moses had nothing to do with the writing of the Pentateuch, but that Ezra was the author. The manner of this portion, and we may add the views asserted in it, cannot be approved. "The Hebrew God" is an unfortunate chapter, full of wild fancies and baseless hypotheses. Nor can "Saints and Sinners" be praised. "The Age of the Earth" brings together a number of statements and extracts establishing its great antiquity, in opposition to the Hebrew records. This is good and conclusive. We fear that the publication will not contribute to the depreciation of the Commentary aimed at, because its author is somewhat reckless. Lacking caution, indulging in a style of language unsuited to the gravity of the subject, and occasionally betraying ignorance of things he ought to know, he will repel many readers.

Bishop Colenso's large pamphlet<sup>11</sup> examines the Introductions to the Pentateuch and Genesis, with the book of Genesis itself, following the Bishop of Ely through all his arguments and observations. As Dr. Browne's part of the Speaker's Commentary on the Pentateuch is the

<sup>10</sup> "The Speaker's Commentary." Reviewed by Thomas Lumsden Strange. London: Trübner and Co. 1871.

<sup>11</sup> "The New Bible Commentary, by Bishops and Other Clergy of the Anglican Church, Critically Examined by the Right Revd. J. W. Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal." Part I. London: Longman and Co. 1871.

weakest in the volume, Dr. Colenso has an easy task in refuting his arguments for Mosaic authorship, in pointing out his ignorance, and exposing his evasions. But he performs the work thoroughly, with a full knowledge of the subject, and a critical ability possessed by none of the brethren who denounce him. His logic is unanswerable; and though there are so many details in his work, we have found few from which we dissent. At p. 131 he errs in saying that Genesis xxv. 1-6 is Jehovistic. It is Elohist. Why waste so much strength and time on a commentary so far behind the critical results of the day, and having no peculiar excellence? Though born and nursed in the interests of orthodoxy, it cannot preserve alive opinions which the most learned men of the age have shown to be untenable. Colenso attaches too much importance to a book ushered into the world under the auspices of bishops and other dignitaries of the Church, because the Church is behind the science of the day, and props up traditional faiths that criticism and philosophy have killed outright, by statements essentially feeble or obviously incorrect. Is it desirable to prove that Bishop Browne is a poor Hebraist and a perfunctory reasoner?

Mr. Pratt's work is now in a sixth edition,<sup>13</sup> and therefore it is unnecessary to dwell upon it. Its object is to demonstrate that Scripture and Science are never at variance. The sacred volume, it is asserted, comes encompassed with sufficient evidence that it is the written word of God, and therefore free from error of every kind. Being infallible in all respects, true science cannot prove it to be wrong. The scientific knowledge of the author is usually adequate for the purpose he adduces it, though it is gathered from books, not from independent investigation. He is versed in the speculations and researches of scientific men, though he does not always agree with them, and can give reasons for dissent. On the other hand, his interpretations of Scripture are often forced and incorrect. Holding the theory of plenary inspiration, long ago abandoned by good critics, his attempts to make some conclusions of science square with the Bible prove failures. In vain does he appeal to Drs. McCaul and Pusey; their knowledge will not be accepted. In vain does he attempt to refute Mr. Goodwin and Bishop Colenso in their expositions of some parts of Genesis; they cannot be dislodged. Geology and Scripture are undoubtedly irreconcilable in the three leading particulars noticed in p. 42 and subsequent ones. Instead of the two theories of interpretation, *the natural* and *the period-day*, one solving the difficulties, neither does so. Mr. Pratt himself makes several valid objections to the latter; but the former, which he adopts, is equally vulnerable, since it does violence to the Hebrew record. The connexion forbids the insertion of a long period between the original act of creation (Genesis i. 1) and the supposed state of the earth described in the second verse, for *the heavens and earth* of the one are equivalent to *the earth* of the other. Besides, it is unphilosophical to translate Genesis i. 14 as if it meant the mere *appointment of the sun and moon to a particular purpose or use*; the verse denotes their

<sup>13</sup> "Scripture and Science not at Variance." By J. H. Pratt, M.A., F.R.S. London: Hatchard. 1871.

original creation, and the Hebrew will bear no other sense. Again, the word translated *firmament*, and rightly so, implies the belief of a solid, firm vault, which was the Hebrew conception of the sky overhead. The reasonings against the great age of the human race are equally inconclusive; while the second part of the book advances the strangest hypotheses. One who argues that our Lord and His apostles regarded the first eleven chapters of Genesis as historical, and therefore infallibly inspired, who asserts their freedom from error and their indication of the credibility of a divine incarnation, can extract from the Bible whatever he wills. Starting with its plenary inspiration, he makes all other knowledge that seems to clash with his interpretation of the record imperfect or erroneous. Difficulties disappear before his magic wand; or if he admits them, he "waits, fortified by the experience of the past and by an immovable belief in the inspiration of Holy Scripture, feeling assured that time will turn objections into proofs, and discrepancy into harmony." The Bible is dishonoured by the very praises of some of its advocates, of whom the Archdeacon of Calcutta is one.

Dr. Vaughan's little volume contains prayers for the mornings and evenings of four weeks,<sup>13</sup> which are chaste, simple, and appropriate compositions, based upon and breathing a moderate evangelicalism. We object to various statements and petitions in them, as foreign to the teaching and spirit of Christ; but they are part of a theological system extensively held, and intelligently so by the Master of the Temple. It may seem strange to some that he has not got beyond that system; but many causes conspire to keep Churchmen in the groove of doctrine which appears safe and comfortable. But surely it is time to hesitate about the truth of such statements as, "We are sinners by the inheritance of a fallen nature;" "in spirit and motive, in thought and temper, in word and act, we have sinned in everything." The preface is written in a modest and pleasing style.

It is impossible to deny that the subjects discussed in the volume of a Septuagenarian are passing through the minds of thoughtful men at the present time in forms more or less distinct, according to the temperament, culture, and circumstances which have moulded those minds.<sup>14</sup> They are of the highest concernment to the welfare of man individually and socially. The author seems to be a theist, who rejects Revelation because of its contrariety to reason—the Revelation supposed to be contained in the Old Testament and that in the New. In the first letter he shows that the Church has failed to promote man's well-being in the world, having been a hindrance instead of a help to progress. Here his views will commend themselves to most of the educated who have learned to think for themselves, having laid aside early notions which they were taught to receive as true. The Church, as he insists with a plausibility hard to resist, has hindered the education of the young, by insisting on dogmas and catechisms as the main

<sup>13</sup> "Family Prayers." By C. J. Vaughan, D.D. London: Strahan. 1871.

<sup>14</sup> "The Problem of the World and the Church, Reconsidered in Three Letters to a Friend." By a Septuagenarian. London: Longman and Co. 1871.

part of the business. The second lecture is probably the chief one in the author's view, exhibiting his opinion of the world's providential government. There are invariable laws; and man's only hope of well-being in the world depends on the regulation of his conduct according to them. Material well-being is the first consideration, the moral and spiritual the next; cultivation in both being all in all. The third letter is occupied with a consideration of the leading doctrines taught by the Church, which are rejected as legendary, or stripped of a supernatural character. A number of opinions respecting a future state are collected in the appendix. The work proceeds from a man of wide reading, intelligent, thoughtful, hopeful of humanity's future. Without philosophical breadth or depth, and deficient in the power of analysis, he takes a common-sense view of the divine government, and the duties of men under it. It is easy for him to show the fallibility of the Bible, and the co-existence of error with inspiration; but he is somewhat sanguine and one-sided as to humanity's improvement and perfectibility by observing natural laws. We cannot think that human nature is so good as he considers it to be; or that the education he recommends would effect so great a change. His statements often require qualification. Nor is it altogether just to take Calvinism as *the* Church-system and then to argue against it. There are also unguarded statements about Christ's teaching. Though the writer admits that the gospels often distort and misrepresent it, he assumes certain parts to be authentic and finds fault upon that imaginary basis. Thus he affirms that Jesus preached a local heaven as the Creator's dwelling-place. The knowledge of the Bible possessed by the writer is not minutely accurate; nor does he assign to the sacred volume its due value and influence in the elevation of mankind. Too much is made of the present material world, its comforts and duties; too little of the spiritual and heavenly world. Indeed he does not require a future life to supplement the present one, considering it a mere subject of "high and interesting speculation." The imagination, the ideal, the spiritual element in man has not its proper place in the author's creed; and yet a chief part of our happiness lies there. We doubt much whether "nearly the whole of the evil and suffering in the world is remediable" by attending to the laws of nature; or whether there be in the world "a great preponderance of good." There is a view of Revelation which is not obnoxious to the arguments of the Septuagintarian against the orthodox system; and it might be shown that natural religion is imperfect at the best. But he says correctly, that religion is independent of dogma.

This is the third series of M. Guizot's meditations,<sup>15</sup> in which he undertakes to show the consistency or intimate connexion of Christianity with liberty, morality, and science; the principle and bearing of "Christian ignorance" and faith; as also Christian life attesting such faith. The appendix presents some remarks on the book called "Ecce Homo." It is pleasant to read the mature thoughts of a man

---

<sup>15</sup> "Christianity Viewed in Relation to the Present State of Society and Opinion." By M. Guizot. London: J. Murray. 1871.



like Guizot on the topics embraced by Christianity or intimately associated with its nature. But he deals in general assertions; unable to cope successfully with questions which philosophy and criticism have raised respecting the facts and doctrines of our religion. His ideas are those of the past not the present, as far as a profound insight into Christianity is concerned. Though his aims are pure, his spirit liberal, his attempts to commend religion to the attention of cultivated men in France now alienated from it, laudable, we fear that his exposition of its essential character, which is nothing but the old orthodox view, will not help to procure him a fair hearing even when he points out that liberty, morality, and science are in perfect harmony with its teachings. The volume contains some good thoughts and will repay perusal; though as a whole it is superficial and dogmatic. The long preface, written in 1868, before the late war had begun, indicates a pretty just appreciation of his countrymen.

The treatise "*De Civitate Dei*" is Augustine's most elaborate work.<sup>16</sup> It is apologetic and didactic, an exposition of the Christian system and of its superiority to all other forms of truth. The genius and learning of this African father appear conspicuously in the work. It reflects the characteristics of a mind logical, acute, fiery, philosophical, profound, comprehensive, methodical. Viewed in the light of modern culture, however, the philosophy and theology of Augustine are all but valueless. In elaborating and perpetuating the system of theology usually called Calvinism, the world and the Church must regard the influence of Augustine as pernicious. The book has only a historical interest at the present day; for its doctrines are too monstrous to find adherents except among the slaves of obsolete creeds. The work is tedious, full of repetitions, and of revolting ideas about God in His relations to man. The translation is good in the main, though it might be more exact and accurate in the rendering of peculiar words and phrases. What it suffers from is an imperfect mastery of good English. The translator does not write well himself, as his preface shows; and his version reads awkwardly at times, as we see at the passage in vol. i. p. 300, beginning with "Hence" and ending with "understood." His estimate of the work itself is strange in these days; hard to be accounted for except on the principle of narrow attachment to a theology dishonouring to God and man.

Mr. Bisset's volume contains eight essays, all tending to show in different forms the difficulty of arriving at historical truth.<sup>17</sup> They discuss such subjects as, Is there a science of government? Hobbes, James Mill, Hume, Sir Walter Scott, the Commonwealth, Prince Henry, and Sir Thomas Overbury. Politics, philosophy, and history are treated of, chiefly the last, where the author is much more in his element than he is either in politics or philosophy. The book contains sufficient evidence of the writer's ability, judgment, familiarity with certain portions of English history, and clear perception of the

<sup>16</sup> "*The City of God.*" Translated by the Rev. M. Dods, M.A. Edinburgh: Clark. 1871.

<sup>17</sup> "*Essays on Historical Truth.*" By Andrew Bisset. London: Longman and Co. 1871.

general issue of conflicting testimonies. His discussions are conducted in a style of moderation and impartiality calculated to convince the reader. Some of them throw new light on dark passages in the history of England; for Mr. Bisset has spared no pains to arrive at the truth of points on which the State papers are either silent or imperfect. The best essay in the volume is that on Cromwell's government, which is eminently just and fair. Here the author is at home. The last two essays are also excellent. That on Sir Walter Scott as a historian, which is the longest, may be also commended. The character of James I. appears throughout in a dark and repulsive light. The least satisfactory essay is that on James Mill, with whose philosophy Mr. Bisset seems to agree, and whose history of India he exalts sufficiently high. It is doubtful whether the author be conversant with mental philosophy. The discussions on Hobbes and Hume, though containing some good remarks, are scarcely adequate to the subjects. But the volume has considerable merit, and will not disappoint the reader. The judicial character of the author's mind enables him to avoid the exaggerations and hasty generalizations into which the best historians too generally run; while he sees the necessity of a wide induction to educe a right conclusion from the tangled web of history.

The manual of logic which Professor Ueberweg published some years ago became very popular among German students.<sup>18</sup> It suited their requirements better than any other, being concise, clear, systematic, comprehensive, and scientific; the work of a man who knew all the topics he handled, and who thought independently. The treatise is occupied with the principal questions relating to the problem, sphere, and arrangement of logic, and to the standpoint from which it is treated as a theory of knowledge. In a didactic view, general logic is exhibited clearly and completely as a theory of knowledge, the chief movements in its historical development being described. Founded on the works of former philosophers and logicians, Ueberweg's contributes to the solution of several single problems. The book shows great ability, and is all but indispensable to every student of philosophy. It is the best text-book of logic for advanced students in the English language; and Mr. Lindsay deserves thanks for translating it. By inserting the opinions of the more prominent English logicians on the points discussed, and adding four excellent appendices on recent logical speculation in England, the quantification of the predicate, the doctrine of the essence, and the fundamental principles of ethics, he has also enhanced the value of the book. The translator, who is himself versed in the topics discussed by the German professor, has rendered the original faithfully. The Introduction will probably be found most interesting to general readers; the first four parts and the sixth may come next in importance. Ueberweg's system may be called an ideal-realism. It differs from Kant's views in aiming at a comparatively objective theory of knowledge, as also from Hegel's views of *a priori* forms of

---

<sup>18</sup> "System of Logic and History of Logical Doctrines." By Dr. F. Ueberweg. Translated from the German, with Notes and Appendices, by Thos. M. Lindsay, M.A. London: Longman and Co. 1871.

purely subjective origin yet objective validity. According to him, scientific insight is reached by combining the facts of experience according to the logical rules, which are conditioned by the objective order of things, and whose observance insures an objective validity for our knowledge. But we must refer genuine students of science to the book itself, which will stimulate thought by introducing them to the masterly views of a philosopher, whose recent loss is much to be deplored.

Dr. McCosh's work consists of lectures delivered in New York on the foundation established by Mr. Ely.<sup>19</sup> They are divided into three series—Christianity and Physical Science; Christianity and Mental Science; Christianity and Historical Investigation. The author traverses a wide field, with no faltering step or timid distrust of his abilities. Discussing the argument from design, the subject of development, the origin of species, the law of natural selection, he comes in contact with Darwin, Huxley, Wallace, Tyndall, and others. In examining Christianity in its relation to mental science, he combats Comte, Herbert Spencer, Rationalism, the Boston theology, Büchner, Maudesley, Bain, Mill, &c. The third series deals with the life of Jesus in the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and St. Paul's epistles, refuting Renan's lucubrations. The work cannot be considered a fresh contribution to philosophy or theology, because it exhibits little more than a series of remarks on a variety of subjects, which are neither original nor striking. Dr. McCosh says over again many things which have been said already in a better way than his. His manner is egotistical and his style bad. Frequent allusions to himself should not have appeared; and his English ought to be improved. The second series is the best in the volume. In it we find some good and pertinent arguments. The three appendices too—viz., Gaps in the Theory of Development, Darwin's Descent of Man, Principles of Herbert Spencer's Philosophy, deserve attention, being favourable specimens of the author's reasoning. But the first series is poor. Dr. McCosh is not a scientific man, and is unable to grapple successfully with the acute votaries of science. The third series is the weakest of the three, showing an ignorance of recent critical results in relation to the New Testament which could not have been expected from a collegiate divine. Apologetic orthodoxy is not always learned. He refutes Renan to his own satisfaction; but Renan himself is neither a masterly critic nor a fair representative of the state of historical criticism. We need not point out the blunders of Dr. McCosh in this department. The heading of one of his paragraphs is, "We have four gospels, and yet the account which they give is one." "The third gospel and the book of Acts must have been published long before the end of the first century." Basilides, as quoted by Hippolytus, "makes use of St. John and St. Luke." Such assertions are easily made; they have been often refuted. Dr. McCosh's scholarship is of a very perfunctory character; and as he lectured to an orthodox

<sup>19</sup> "Christianity and Positivism: a Series of Lectures to the Times on Natural Theology and Apologetics." By James McCosh, D.D., LL.D. London: Macmillan. 1871.

audience from an orthodox standpoint, he could venture to utter platitudes and incorrect statements without fear of contradiction. Yet the man who undertakes to refute able scholars and thinkers should be more cautious than to affirm that Comte had no God; or to re-assert that Luke's account of the taxing of Cyrenius has been verified by Zumpt, when Zumpt's argument fails in the very place where it is most needed, as has been shown by Strauss, Davidson, and others. The book will add nothing to Dr. McCosh's reputation; on the contrary it will lessen it considerably in the eyes of those who have read more than the President of the College of New Jersey, and can think independently of a Calvinistic creed.

Dr. Doherty has been engaged in framing outlines of an organic philosophy, and has already published two volumes of the series.<sup>20</sup> The present is the third, giving an outline of systematic biology. The author distinguishes four general modes of action as primary aspects of biological unity in human nature—body, soul, mind, spirit; and analyses in separate books or divisions the physical organism in four secondary aspects—viz., those of anatomy, physiology, embryology, and genealogy; finding parallels between the body, soul, mind, and spirit in each of these aspects, the first being the type of natural order. This parallelism, which is carried out ingeniously and minutely, constitutes the leading feature of the book. The author shows considerable power of analysis and especially of systematizing. He is familiar with the body and its functions; has studied, too, man's mental and moral nature. Physiology and psychology are treated together in a method which is at least original. Several portions are ably wrought out and well expressed. But the new terminology is repellent. The vocabulary applied to soul, mind, and spirit, as well as to body, is too extensive, technical, and difficult to be readily adopted. Soul, mind, and spirit are distinguished and analysed in a way peculiar to the writer, and somewhat perplexing. He divides and subdivides in a strange fashion, so that sober philosophy is likely to turn away in contempt. It is true that Dr. Doherty gives definitions of his peculiar terms; but they lack precision and exactness. His cumbrous nomenclature darkens his thoughts. The ingenious generalization of the book, based as it is on a careful exploration of particular states of human nature, must be classed among the hypotheses which ardent inquirers are prone to fashion out of shadowy materials. The author's mental science is both defective and erroneous. In the department of physics he is less at fault. Thus when he speaks of "the faculties of intellect" along with "the faculties of pure reason and scientific understanding;" when he defines "wisdom or reason" as "a mental mode of motion in finite or infinite degrees of extension," he philosophizes loosely. Yet the book proceeds from one who can think and write clearly at times. The fourth part, on the will, is interspersed with excellent reflections; and on cosmogonies the author speaks rationally. In other places he expresses belief in spirits revealing a

<sup>20</sup> "Organic Philosophy. Vol. III. Outlines of Biology—Body, Soul, Mind, Spirit." By Hugh Doherty, M.D. London: Trübner and Co. 1871.

knowledge of the invisible world and in a pre-existent state of the soul as "a genetic entity," which are unscientific ideas.

Mr. Henslow briefly attempts to point out the harmony between *Genesis* and *Geology*.<sup>21</sup> The preacher has not succeeded in reconciling them; while he has concealed, or at least not brought out distinctly, the points in which they are at variance. A few observations on *evolution* are good; but the curious assertion that it has partially failed *twice* in the world's history does away with the admission of that doctrine. He is an indifferent expositor of *Genesis*, and writes in a slovenly style.

Mr. Carroll has collected extracts from *Dorner*, *Bishop O'Brien*, *Mr. Moorhouse*, *Pressensé*, *Prof. Plumptre*, *Mr. Gladstone*, *Mr. S. Brooke*, and *F. Godet*, all orthodox men, containing interpretations of our Lord's Deity irreconcilable with the statements embodied in the articles and creeds of *Evangelical Christendom*.<sup>22</sup> The Appendix gives two extracts about the atonement. A few observations by the editor accompany the quotations. Mr. Carroll's object is to show the disintegration which orthodoxy is undergoing at the present time. This is commendable, as orthodoxy is essentially intolerant. The pamphlet deserves attention and the editor thanks from all honest inquirers.

*Dr. Caird's* sermon is excellent in substance and spirit, worthy of the occasion, worthy of the man.<sup>23</sup> It contains good ideas expressed in appropriate, sometimes eloquent, diction. Free from the enunciation of dogma, the writer plants religion on its true basis, the spiritual instincts of man's nature. If all divines preached thus, churches would be more frequented by thoughtful men.

Two lectures on education were delivered before the Sunday Lecture Society, in London, by *Ed. Maitland of Brighton*.<sup>24</sup> Excellent in substance and spirit, they indicate the right use of the Bible in schools, and the abuse to which it is exposed by injudicious advocates. The author solves what is called "the religious difficulty" fairly and rationally. A few of his statements are incorrect, others incautious. Here and there also we observe a desire to attribute less value to the Bible than it rightfully possesses. But the lectures are the production of one who treats his subject much better than most divines.

*Mr. Deans's* lectures are from a *Swedenborgian* point of view.<sup>25</sup> Sometimes he agrees with *Mr. Voysey*, at other times he does not. *Swedenborgians* do violence to the Bible by their principles of interpretation, but they are right in departing from certain irrational

<sup>21</sup> "Genesis and Geology. A Plea for the Doctrine of Evolution: being a Sermon by the Rev. G. Henslow, M.A." London: Hardwicke. 1871.

<sup>22</sup> "The Collapse of the Faith: or the Deity of Christ as now Taught by the Orthodox." Edited by Rev. W. G. Carroll, A.M. Ramsgate: Thos. Scott. 1871.

<sup>23</sup> *Christian Manliness. A Sermon Preached before the University of Glasgow.*" By Rev. John Caird, D.D. Glasgow: Maclehose. 1871.

<sup>24</sup> *Jewish Literature and Modern Education: or the Use and Abuse of the Bible in the Schoolroom.* Ramsgate: Thos. Scott. 1871.

<sup>25</sup> "A Defence of Revealed Religion: being Strictures upon the Views of the Rev. C. Voysey, B.A." Six Lectures by Joseph Deans. London: James Speirs. 1871.

doctrines current among the orthodox. The lectures have no special value.

"The Immortal Fountain"<sup>26</sup> is an allegory setting forth spiritual truth. The story is prettily told, angels playing the principal part in it; and it seems to proceed from a Swedenborgian source. It may please and profit the young.

---

## POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES, AND TRAVELS.

THE subject of a reform in our methods of representation, with a view not merely to prevent bribery in its grossest form, but to repress the mere brute influence of wealth, quackery, and puffing of all sorts, has both in this and other countries, since the appearance of Mr. Hare's valuable work, attracted to itself the attention and labours of a bright succession of eminent and capable writers. Each fresh treatise has carried the controversy forward, either in supplementing or correcting or expanding some of the details of Mr. Hare's scheme. The work of Mr. Archibald Dobbs,<sup>1</sup> unpretending as it is in its form, must take a very high rank in the development of this vital discussion. It not only embraces the mechanical aspects of the question, but propounds, without obtruding, very lofty political views, and bases the reform of what might appear to be the mere structural form of representation upon the deepest political needs and aspirations. Mr. Dobbs's main suggestion is, that instead of alternative votes being given, as under Mr. Hare's scheme, no elector is to have more than one vote, which (as under that scheme) he is to be entitled to give to any candidate for any constituency in the country. A "quota" is to be ascertained by dividing the number of the persons who have actually voted by the number of members to be elected, and every candidate who has received votes equal to, and exceeding the quota is to be at once declared elected. A number of members will still be wanting, through candidates not obtaining the quota needed, and some of the members elected will have received votes more or less exceeding the quota. Mr. Dobbs suggests that it should rest with these elected members to determine to whom, among the existing candidates, they will apportion and transfer their surplus votes. When all these votes have been so apportioned, the votes of candidates who themselves have not obtained a number of votes amounting to the quota may be employed at their discretion for a similar purpose. The effect of this tolerably simple modification of Mr. Hare's plan would be constitutionally enormous. It would give a reasonable access of strength to the executive government, but (as Mr. Dobbs points out), could not lead to that strength being abused, "because if the leaders misuse their power, the general party-vote will suffer. Electors will make selection for themselves also, and will vote for men who will not mis-

---

<sup>26</sup> "The Immortal Fountain, or the Travels of Two Sisters to the Fountain of Beauty." By R. Edleston. London: Speirs, 1871.

<sup>1</sup> "General Representation on a Complete Readjustment and Modification of Mr. Hare's Plan." By Archibald E. Dobbs, M.A. London: Longman, 1871.

use their strength." Mr. Dobbs's pamphlet is written in the best style, the whole working out of the method proposed being scrupulously traced out from the commencement to the end in all its details. Never have practice and theory been better exhibited side by side in a speculative political work.

The science of political economy has always suffered, both in public estimation and in the method of its cultivation, through the fact of it seeming to occupy a kind of border territory between the physical and moral sciences. Professor Jevons has done invaluable service by courageously claiming political economy to be strictly a branch of applied mathematics.<sup>2</sup> That the quantities dealt with are difficult of estimation in terms of other ordinary units of number, weight, or distance is no argument against this view of the subject. The question is not whether the things measured can be estimated by familiar processes, but whether they can be precisely measured at all. Electricity, heat, and nervous energy were for ages only vague phenomena, even when so much as noticed. It is only of late they have been discovered to be strictly "quantitative," and therefore capable of being submitted to the most exact mathematical reasoning. Professor Jevons holds that the doctrine of utility, thoroughly understood and not abused, supplies a universal method of expressing in the most severe mathematical language all the truths and problems of political economy. It is true that this science is conversant with only a low order of pleasures and pains, and Professor Jevons expresses very succinctly the essential limitation of the science due to that fact. "It is the lowest rank of feelings which we here treat. The calculus of utility aims at supplying the ordinary wants of man at the least cost of labour. Each labourer, in the absence of other motives, is supposed to devote his energy to the accumulation of wealth. A high calculus of moral right and wrong would be needed to show how he may best employ that wealth for the good of others as well as himself. But when that high calculus gives no prohibition, we need the lower calculus to gain us the utmost good in matters of moral indifference." The keystone of Professor Jevons's theory is supplied by his treatment of exchange. He gets rid of the ambiguous word "value," and substitutes for it "ratio of exchange." After defining the essential expressions "market" and "trading body," the following general proposition is established—that "the ratio of exchange of any two commodities will be inversely as the final degrees of utility of the quantities of commodity available for consumption after the exchange is effected." In the following way the notion of utility for the present purpose is reducible to distinct mathematical expression. It is a quantity of at least two dimensions—one dimension consisting in the quantity of a given commodity, and another in the intensity of the effect produced upon the consumer by an unit of the quantity. Utility is described to be a "circumstance of things arising out of their relation to men's requirements." Direction, potentiality, capacity for distribution in different uses,

<sup>2</sup> "The Theory of Political Economy." By Stanley Jevons, M.A. London: Macmillan. 1871.

are again quantities capable of numerical estimate for the purpose of completing the mathematical expression for a degree of utility. It is from statistics of actual demand that the operation on the consumer's mind must be calculated, and in order to obtain reliable statistics for this purpose, the condition of the market, and of the trading bodies concerned, must be carefully investigated, and sufficiently numerous observations made to get rid of accidental errors on either side. It is then by the theory of infinitesimal variation, that, through the help of the above equation, any problem whatever on the subject admits of instant solution. Any unknown quantity is ascertainable in the terms of known ones.

In a series of papers based on articles originally contributed to the *Scotsman* newspaper, Mr. Macdonnell discusses at considerable length and detail a large number of problems arising out of the leading industrial, commercial, and social facts of the day.<sup>3</sup> Such facts are wealth, capital, industrial education, machinery, credit, co-operation, trades-unions, protection, patents, charity, pauperism. Amid such a mass of material it is natural that a quantity of very heterogeneous facts, historical, descriptive, and speculative, should circulate in somewhat eddying whirls. In truth, the work bespeaks its origin in the periodical press too much for the purposes of calm theory, though to that origin it owes a good deal of intrinsic value. It will be found a valuable compendium to any one who has to treat upon any of the subjects handled, and who wants to know what is the actual position of the questions, and what has been their recent history. The chapters on Charity and Pauperism are good specimens of the wide range of the work. They contain an account of the earliest English laws for the relief of the poor, and the later history of the laws and of the amendments to them; also a view of the system of relieving the poor in Paris, and an investigation of current theories in this country as to the duty of providing sick relief for the poor. The reasoning is a little diffuse, but the practical remedies suggested, such as the amendment of the law of settlement, the classification of paupers, and emigration, are obvious steps in the way of a true solution of the problems.

The constant resurrection of Protectionist theories, especially in countries where Protectionist practices are recognised, is a phenomenon which cannot excite astonishment, however it may annoy and distress. Dr. William Elder, of Philadelphia, in the course of discussing a series of "Questions of the Day,"<sup>4</sup> considers the most prominent and plausible objections to Protection, and investigates the effect of "Protection in national history." Dr. Elder says it would be tedious as it would be unnecessary to give instances either in particulars or summaries, to prove that protective duties, levied in the strictness of the principle, always secure the consumers from arbitrary prices; always in good time reduce prices to the level of general rewards of labour

<sup>3</sup> "A Survey of Political Economy." By John Macdonnell, M.A. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas. 1871.

<sup>4</sup> "Questions of the Day: Economic and Social." By Dr. William Elder. Philadelphia. 1871.



and capital; always *throw their burden upon the foreign producer*, when judiciously adjusted to the conditions and capabilities of the people; and the like. As to the effect of "Protection on national history," it is said that the testimony of all history proves this broad proposition: that not a single nation on the earth has attained a leading position, not a nation in the past or present has maintained the rank that entitles it to be called a "power," except those who have firmly maintained an adopted policy of protection in the direction of their international relations. This, by the way, is a curious instance of the argument, *post hoc: ergo propter hoc*. The whole reasoning, which it is not necessary to combat here, is an exemplification of the latent selfishness and short-sightedness of the whole Protectionist policy.

We have on former occasions called attention to the vigorous and original thought, sometimes indeed taking channels a little sinuous, even from a liberal point of view, of the "*Essays of a Birmingham Manufacturer*."<sup>5</sup> A third volume has now appeared, and the essays in it are not less striking and suggestive than those in the former volumes. A very long and carefully wrought-out essay is styled "*The New Academy*." The object of it is to carry out in a really practical and harmless way a favourite conception of many eminent men—that is, the creation of an order of purely intellectual merit. Many difficulties are at once suggested by the very mention of the scheme, such as the improbability of the best men competing in mature life; the openings afforded to corruption and to abuse of patronage which have always haunted the regal rewards of genius; the appointment of competent examiners, and the selection of subjects for examination. As to the last point Mr. Sargant would have the examination extend to every possible topic of intellectual inquiry, and would request candidates to forward all their works to the examiners, however brief and fugitive, due precautions being taken that the authenticity of the writings is duly guaranteed. The main argument in favour of this institution is the stimulus it would afford to the richer and more leisurely classes of society to take to serious studies instead of spending their days in idleness, dissipation, or aimless sports. Another argument is the extreme difficulty of publication that awaits a poor author—that difficulty being the greater, the more out of the way, and therefore possibly the more precious, is the contribution. "Honours now awarded to literature and philosophy are not understood or not appreciated. Fellows of the Royal Society, Honorary Doctors of Civil Law, go about the world unnoticed, and the titles so bestowed do nothing to impress on the minds of the mass of men that grave thinkers are worthy to be ranked as leaders of the world." Suffice it to add that Mr. Sargant has foreseen the most obvious objections to his scheme, and has argued it out with great display of real acumen and learning. Another essay, of rather a startling character, on the "*Princess and her Dowry*," suggests a new method of taxation, by which the persons who may be taken to appreciate most

---

<sup>5</sup> "*Essays of a Birmingham Manufacturer*." Vol. III. By William Lucas Sargant. London: Williams and Norgate. 1871.

freely the advantages and enjoy the perquisites of a Court should alone contribute. This might be effected by opening a special Dowry Fund, for which no income under 300*l.* a year should be chargeable. An essay on "Comparative Morality" establishes by very interesting statistics that the sexual morality of England is better than that of almost every other European country, and that of London than that of the country and of the great provincial towns, excepting Liverpool.

In a clear and vigorous essay entitled "Landlordism,"<sup>6</sup> Mr. David Syme expounds the problem of the reconstruction of land tenure in England, and presents in a very attractive and intelligible form the special solution of the problem, which is to be found in the resumption of the whole land of England by the State. Mr. Syme points out that the existing and past condition of land tenure in England has been and is, in the highest degree, unfavourable to the agricultural labourer, to the cultivation of the soil, and, indeed, to the general well-being of tenants, landowners, producers, and consumers. The same has been the case in every country where the rural population have been dispossessed. And Mr. Syme gives special instances from Rome, Russia since the commencement of the seventeenth century, France before the Revolution, the Southern States of America, and Western Australia. Wherever the land is in the hands of a few large proprietors, cultivation is checked, and the mass of the people are idle, indigent, and improvident. Again farms of moderate extent and security of tenure are, as Mr. Syme takes pains to show, essential conditions for productive farming. "Let the Crown resume possession of the lands, and compensate the owners at so many years' purchase of the present rents, let it retake possession of the land, and lease it in blocks of from ten to two hundred acres; the leases to be for a period of thirty years." A re-valuation could then take place, and the lease might be renewed to the same tenant, conditionally on his paying, in addition to the old rent, half the value accrued since the commencement of his tenancy.

Professor Willis Bund commences a lecture, delivered at University College, by a long quotation from the programme of the Land Tenure Reform Association.<sup>7</sup> It is then charged against the members of that association that they seek to "revive a system" (either that of common ownership or peasant proprietorship) "which, though fast dying out before increasing knowledge and civilization, has existed from the earliest times of our history." It is said that they wholly ignore the circumstance that such a system has been tried and has failed; that the inroads that modern society has made upon the land laws are the means by which this system has become impossible. They shut their eyes to the fact that instead of creating a novelty, they are but reverting to antiquity: that their object is really retrogressive, not

---

<sup>6</sup> "Landlordism: in its Moral, Social, and Economic Relations." By David Syme. London: Trübner. 1871.

<sup>7</sup> "The Ancient Land Settlement of England. A Lecture delivered at University College, London, October 17th, 1871." By Professor J. W. Willis Bund, M.A. Butterworth. 1871.

progressive. The facts by which this conclusion is endeavoured to be reached are now sufficiently notorious : partly by the help of Nasse's celebrated essay, and partly by that of Professor Maine's "Village Communities." The vein of the reasoning throughout is, of course, that the standpoint is taken from the material and not the social welfare of the community. Thus the accidents of the mode in which wealth is now distributed are taken as the standard for all time. Peasant proprietorship in the future, whatever else its defects, never could be a reproduction of the past.

We have great pleasure in greeting on the other side of the Atlantic, that is in Canada, one of the ablest and most worthy exponents of the claims of women that we have ever had the pleasure of encountering. The Rev. J. Clark Murray's address,<sup>8</sup> delivered at the opening of Queen's College, Kingston, is close and compact in argument, exact and effective in expression, and courageously grapples with the whole question without any show of the native Briton's inveterate habit of shrinking from some one or another of the logical consequences of his principles. Mr. Murray reasons that either woman's work is hereafter to be higher and other than it has been, or else it is to be the same or on the same level as it is now ; on either hypothesis she needs the highest mental qualities, and the best conceivable education to train them. "The advocates of woman's rights demand a recognition not only of woman's rights, but perhaps more truly of her duties. They claim for every woman, high and low, matron and maiden, a right to be something more than a mere ornament of human life—a right to have, like every man, specific duties in the industrial arrangements of society." The consequence of women not being educated to support themselves if necessary, and take their share in public duties, could not be more vividly painted than as follows:—"For how many a woman does it become a torturing alternative, that she shall surrender herself, under the symbol of a love which she does not feel, to one who will provide for her support, or that she shall struggle to support herself without the luxuries, without even the comforts, of her earlier life, by some kind of sadly unremitting and sadly unremunerative toil?"

Among the innumerable squibs forming the flickering train of the "Battle of Dorking," and more or less recalling the vividness of the original, "The Year Before the Battle" is not the least deserving of notice.<sup>9</sup> It is more serious and less funny than most of the rest, but then it is more true and likely to be more really serviceable. The following may be taken as specimens of the liveliness and faithfulness of the picture :—

"It is quite a mistake to suppose that our ruin is to be accounted for altogether by our want of forts, defective armaments, and imperfect army and

<sup>8</sup> "The Higher Education of Woman : " an Address delivered at the opening of Queen's College, Kingston, Canada ; Session 1871-2. By Rev. J. Clark Murray. Kingston. 1871.

<sup>9</sup> "The Year Before the Battle: a Record of some of the Characters and Tendencies of English Society during the Middle Decades of the Nineteenth Century." By a Wayside Observer. London : Elliot Stock. 1913.

navy organization ; and no doubt if there had been more honesty and earnestness of purpose in the two great political parties, then known as Liberals and Conservatives, and now represented by the Revolutionists and Loyalists, many of the defects of our army and navy management would have been effectively remedied."

And again—

"The moral and physical condition of our soldiers is a subject about which I scarcely dare trust myself to speak to you. The frightful amount of disease among them, resulting from their immoral practices, can hardly be conceived. A considerable percentage were constantly in a condition which unfitted them for ordinary drill practice even; and the prostitution, which was the real cause of that state of things, was, in a measure, sanctioned and regulated by law."

On the publication of the first edition of Mr. W. F. Rae's "*Westward by Rail*"<sup>10</sup> we had occasion to notice the account given of the Mormon settlement in Utah as favourably distinguishable from nearly all the other numerous accounts published by English travellers on their return home. Mr. Rae is a really good describer, accurate, picturesque, and bold in outline, but without any tinge of sentimentality or extravagance. Recent events in the United States and the interposition of the central government have fixed of late public attention still more closely upon the government of Brigham Young than when Mr. Rae published his first edition. Many questions are naturally suggested by the pending political situation to which the additional matter in the present edition supplies an answer. It appears that the United States law is now impartially administered in Utah by a Governor and a Chief Justice whom it has been found impossible to bribe, cajole, or intimidate. Governor Shaffer, appointed by General Grant to rule over the territory, has successfully prohibited all unlawful gatherings of the Mormon militia. The Chief Justice has declined to naturalize any alien openly living with more wives than one in wilful defiance of an Act of Congress. Brigham Young's main political obstacle of late has been the schism created by the "Godbeites" or members of the Church of Zion. They allied themselves with the Gentiles prior to the first municipal elections held after the formal establishment of their church. Brigham Young checkmated this movement by procuring the passing of an Act for conferring the suffrage upon women. "President Young's triumph was complete. The coalition candidates were defeated by a majority so large and compact as to demonstrate the futility of renewing the struggle till some radical change occurred in the attitude of the contending parties." Indeed, Mr. Rae throws some discredit on the sincerity of the religious zeal of the "Godbeites," as he says that it was not till President Young founded co-operative stores which had "Holiness to the Lord" for their motto, and monopoly for their privilege, that Mr. Godbe, the head of a large retail establishment, was moved to call in

---

<sup>10</sup> "*Westward by Rail: a Journey to San Francisco and back, and a Visit to the Mormons.*" By W. F. Rae. Second Edition, with a new Introductory Chapter. London: Longmans. 1871.

question his temporal authority. Mr. Rae gives a most interesting account of the mode of study pursued in the Mormon Deseret University, especially for commercial purposes. The student is taught by example how to conduct mercantile correspondence, despatch telegrams, insure property, recover compensation for injury or loss. A postal and telegraphic department, a banking and insurance office, are alternately managed by one division of the students and utilized by another. Mr. Rae appends some curious information on the current speculations in gold and silver mines in Nevada and California. The account is not gratifying to the pride of English adventurers. It appears that not till, in the opinion of the American investing public, mining in California and Nevada had been nearly "played out" did the desire to part with promising properties to English adventurers become intense and general. In the territory of Utah the mining fever is now raging with as great a fury as it once raged in the State of Nevada. During the past three years, indeed, some of the mines which the owners would readily transfer to English capitalists have been worked quietly and successfully. "Whether," says Mr. Rae, "they have been partially or entirely exhausted will be learned, perhaps, at the cost of English speculators." Mr. Rae, in commenting on the prospects of the Pacific Railway at the present time, says that for trading purposes the Suez Canal has proved a formidable rival to the Pacific Railway. The railway passenger traffic, on the other hand, has been in excess of the highest estimates. It will be seen from the above brief notice of the new matter appearing in the present edition that the whole work as it is now presented is at once the most modern and the most reliable authority on the increasingly important subjects with which it deals.

In a pamphlet entitled "*Indian Mussulmans*,"<sup>11</sup> consisting of three letters reprinted from *The Times*, Mr. W. Nassau Lees draws attention in a very forcible style to the neglect of the just political claims of the Mohammedans in India. The letters were written *à propos* of the assassination of the late lamented Mr. Justice Norman. Mr. Lees is clearly of opinion that this act was dictated or contrived, not by an association composed of the "dregs of society," but by a body of considerable political power and of so much daring that, had it suited their purpose, her Majesty's Viceroy, instead of the Chief Justice, would have been the victim singled out for destruction. The main grievances of the Mohammedans are alleged to be that "what is called the Indian Commission unjustly deprived many of their class of the lands granted to them by the Mohammedan sovereigns of India; that (2) their civil and religious law has been broken by the Act securing to converts to Christianity the rights of inheritance which they had forfeited under the Mohammedan Code; that (3) the habit of appointing native Mohammedan judges and law officers was given up; that (4) funds left by charitable and pious Moslems for educational purposes have been devoted to other purposes; that (5) they have been elbowed out of all Government appointments by Hindoos; and that (6) no

---

<sup>11</sup> "*Indian Mussulmans*." By W. Nassau Lees. London: Williams and Norgate. 1871.

offices under Government are open to Mussulmans learned in their own sciences, laws, literature, and language; that, consequently, Moslem learning and learned men have disappeared, and their community is left in darkness, while the Government system of education is such that they cannot accept it and retain the respect of their co-religionists, even if they may remain good Moslems." The main portion of Mr. Lees' work is devoted to considering measures for redressing the last, or the Educational, grievance. Lord Macaulay is severely criticized for the opinions uttered in a notorious Education Minute in favour of teaching English in the Government Colleges as a "Classical" language, at the expense of Sanscrit and Arabic. Mr. Lees asserts that Lord Macaulay therein misled the Indian Government of the day, viewing, as he did, the question solely as one of the comparative values of the literature extant in the English language and in the classical languages of the East, and completely ignoring all consideration of the value of the latter as a means of mental culture and discipline. Mr. Lees had some time ago proposed that in the Calcutta University there should be an Oriental as well as an English faculty of Arts, and that in this faculty Education, instead of being given in the languages of the foreigner, should be given in the languages of the people of the country, their classics taking the place of Latin and Greek, and English, though a compulsory study, being treated simply as a language; and that all natives, Hindoo or Mussulman, should be free to graduate in the *litteris humanioribus* of the East and the West, as they pleased.

In the course of the year 1868-9, the English Government authorized Sir Henry James to use all the machinery of the Ordnance Survey Department in aid of an expedition then being planned for a complete and systematic survey of the interior of the Peninsula of Sinai. The party consisted of five gentlemen of experience and ability to whom the investigation of different departments of science was intrusted—that of gathering stories from the Arabs as well as of making a collection of entomological curiosities—"the habits of the natives afforded every facility for combining the two pursuits"—being confided to Mr. Palmer, whose two volumes<sup>12</sup> give an account of this expedition, and of one which he took during the following season on behalf of the Palestine Exploration Fund. Mr. Palmer claims to have wandered over a larger portion of the Desert than had ever previously been explored, and various personal and circumstantial advantages combine to give greater accuracy and interest to his investigations than have attached to any former ones. He accounts for any discrepancies between former travellers, partly by their want of trained habits of observation, and partly by a secret desire to bring every possible and impossible site into the traveller's own route. A similar desire on the part of the monks on Mount Sinai to group within pilgrimage-distance from their convent all points of interest to pilgrims has probably contributed much to the geographical confusion of the Peninsula. Mr. Palmer begins with stating his conclusion that of the two peaks in controversy Jebel Músa and not

<sup>12</sup> "The Desert of the Exodus." By E. H. Palmer, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Jebel Serbál is the true traditional Sinai, and from time to time he adduces strong reasons for this opinion. He gives his grounds for believing that at a remote date the Red Sea stretched further northwards than now, and that the "Desert of the Exodus" was considerably, if not luxuriantly, wooded, and had therefore a much more copious rainfall. He believes that it is possible, owing to the peculiar nature of the country under consideration, to arrive at a more than plausible conjecture in solution of the long-disputed route indicated by the Mosaic narrative; and, on the line of a march which he traces out, he and Mr. Holland found traces of a huge ancient encampment extending over many miles of country, and connected by Arab tradition with the wanderings of a great pilgrim-caravan. Its locality, just off the ordinary traveller's route to 'Akabah, he identifies with Kibroth Hattaavah. A summary of the results of the first expedition is found in the last few pages of the first volume. Mr. Palmer's second visit was made with only one companion, in order to explore the region between Judea and the Sinaitic Peninsula with a view to ascertain what light could be thrown on the wanderings of the Beni Israel by local traditions, actual traces, or inscriptions. The search for inscribed stones has been rendered peculiarly difficult by the foolish blunders made by the first discoveries of the famous "Moabite Stone," which so impressed the Arabs with the idea of the value of such stones, that Mr. Palmer sums up his investigations in the conclusions that "above ground" there is no second Moabite stone. Hidden, or yet buried, he thinks many might be found by judicious explorers. Many questions of great antiquarian interest are discussed with ability by Mr. Palmer, and the work is enriched with maps and plates of the highest value. The style throughout is good and, apart from the scientific value of the work, the detailed extracts from existing literary and traditional monuments of Arab history and sentiment, arranged as they are in a sufficiently light and, at times, facetious dress, present a treatise of enduring interest and importance.

The partial autobiography given to the world as a portion of Mr. Hawthorne's "Notes of Travels in Europe"<sup>13</sup> would perhaps more suitably have borne a title which would have transferred them to another section of this *Review*, as well as have made them even more generally attractive than they are on outside inspection. Mr. Hawthorne's determination, however, only to derive his information from sight and from living companions, deprives his Notes of the guide-book qualities so frequently pre-eminent in books of travel. Throughout these volumes the reader will find Mr. Hawthorne himself and himself alone, impressionable by every change of wind and temperature, of mood and of association, and as inconsistent in his artistic criticisms and his general tastes as any one of those who dare not, as he does, confess their inconstancy on paper, or even to themselves. It was in January that Mr. Hawthorne went to Paris and thence to Rome, and never was presented a more vivid impression of dreary

---

<sup>13</sup> "Passages from the French and Italian Note-books of Nathaniel Hawthorne." London: Strahan and Co. 1871.

conscientious sightseeing than that which ends, after nine days, with "I am quite tired of Paris, and long for a home more than ever;" while the comment on the Mediterranean is, "I do not like the climate;" and the first four days of Rome call forth the sole comment, "And this is sunny Italy, and genial Rome!" A few days later he writes, "I have seldom or never spent so wretched a time anywhere;" "The sunless, dreary alleys which are called streets in Rome;" "I shall never be able to express how I dislike the place;" "Narrow, stony streets that look worse than the backside lanes of any other city." These words are quoted for the sake of showing how interesting is the tracing, through the candour of this diary, how the writer's mind, at first dead to all the charm around him, poet as he was, opens and rises to so high, deep, and delicate an understanding of Italy and her treasures and their hidden meanings, as are embodied in "Transformation," which has its birth here under our very eyes. After a second winter at Rome, he writes, "Wednesday was the day fixed for our departure from Rome. . . . I looked at everything as if for the last time; nor do I wish ever to see any of these objects again, though no place ever took so strong a hold of my being as Rome, nor ever seemed so close to me and so strangely familiar. . . . I cannot say I hate it, perhaps might fairly own a love for it. But life being too short for such troublesome and questionable enjoyments, I desire never to set eyes on it again." The summer intervening between the two Roman visits was spent in and near Florence; and Mr. Hawthorne's mental difficulties with the Venus di Medici are of great biographical interest. At first he says, "It is of no use to throw heaps of words upon her; for they all fall away, and leave her standing in chaste and naked grace, as untouched as when I began;" "I wonder now any sculptor has had the impertinence to aim at any other presentation of female beauty." But ere long Mr. Power, the American sculptor of the "Greek Slave," so entirely destroys Mr. Hawthorne's faith in his own discrimination as well as in received opinions, that he feels compelled to speak of her eyes as "buttonholes," and only throws a "farewell glance at the Venus di Medici to-day with a strange insensibility." It is a rare delight in these days of self-assertion in artistic matters to read, "In a year's time with the advantage of access to this" (the Pitti) "magnificent gallery, I think I might come to have some little knowledge of pictures. At present I still know nothing; but am glad to find myself capable at least of loving one picture better than another. I cannot always 'keep the heights I gain,' however, and after admiring and being moved by a picture one day, it is within my experience to look at it the next as little moved as if it were a tavern-sign. It is pretty much the same with statuary; the same, too, with those pictured windows of the Duomo, which I described so rapturously a few days ago." The readers of Mr. Hawthorne will not need to be told that these volumes are full of exquisite descriptions when the rapturous mood is on him, and they will anticipate the kindliness and vividness of his sketches of such friends as Mr. and Mrs. Browning, Mrs. Jameson, Miss Bremer, and the artists of whose reciprocal criticisms he was the repository.



Over and above questions of Home, Foreign, and strictly Colonial politics, there is one large and increasingly important class of questions which, from being less concerned with the industrial or self-regarding interests of mankind, are in danger of being overlooked altogether. Such questions are those involved in the contact of the overflowing population of civilized countries with aboriginal races. The policy pursued towards these races has passed through all the grades of neglect, war, attempted extermination, corruption by the introduction of the vices of civilized countries, enslavement, and only here and there, at spasmodic intervals, true humanity exhibiting itself in fostering care and respect for moral rights. The recent murder of Bishop Patteson has tended to fix public attention on a special class of growing evils, of the nature of the most abominable slave-trade, which have long been anxiously watched by a few philanthropists in this country, who have for many years been organized into what is called the "Aborigines' Protection Society."<sup>14</sup> This Society has for months past been doing its utmost to press upon the Colonial Minister and upon the House of Commons the growing enormities arising out of the market in Queensland, Fiji, and other settlements in the same region, for Southsea islanders as labourers, especially in the cultivation of cotton. It is true that the Queensland Government have given a plausible security that no islander shall be trans-shipped to Queensland without satisfactory evidence from independent quarters being obtained of the complete willingness of the islander to go, and of his exact comprehension of the nature of his contract. In the present number of the *Colonial Intelligencer* will be found a mass of evidence establishing that these securities are notoriously good for nothing, that a species of organized kidnapping exists to an extent perfectly monstrous, and that, whatever may be the laws of Queensland, these laws are either not executed by the authorities or are successfully evaded. Since the publication of this number of the *Intelligencer* fresh evidence to the same effect has been pouring in from every side, and the matter will be brought, with as little delay as possible, before the House of Commons. From a study of the *Intelligencer* it will be found that this is only one of a number of similar difficulties, in all parts of the world, on which the Society, with the help of its highly competent and indefatigable secretary, Mr. Chesson, is constantly occupied.

For a vivid sketch of some of the most interesting social characteristics of the modern life of the poorer classes in Scotland, nothing could be more successful than Mr. H. G. Reid's "Past and Present."<sup>15</sup> The title indicates that the features described are those of a transitional sort, and which best indicate the modification being wrought by numerous influences from day to day. The mode of delineation by minute biographical incidents, concrete description, and as little as possible of

---

<sup>14</sup> "The Colonial Intelligencer." A Review of Aboriginal Questions, December, 1871. London: Tweedie. 1871.

<sup>15</sup> "Past and Present, or Social and Religious Life in the North." By H. G. Reid. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglass.

mere philosophical disquisition. A very lively exhibition is given of the actual working of the Co-operative Movement in Edinburgh for building purposes, by a picture of "John Wilson" before his marriage. He has taken ten shares in the "Co-operative Building Company." He hopes to pay them up as soon as possible, as the houses will be ready in a few weeks, and he means to purchase one. "There is the house I've fixed upon; it has three neat airy rooms and a closet; and see—twenty square yards for a garden in front and a fine large green behind for drying clothes." "But," interrupted Mary, "where is the money to buy the house?" "Wait a little," said John, "it needs time to explain this wonderful scheme. The cost of the house is 130*l.*, and I calculate we shall have at least 5*l.* over the marriage and furnishing. Well, in accordance with an understanding between *our* Society and it, the Property Investment Company will advance the balance of 125*l.* on the security of the title-deeds. Then we will pay them 13*l.* a year for fourteen years, when the lease will become really and truly our own." John Wilson is said to be only a type of hundreds of sober and industrious workmen who have, through the agency of the Edinburgh Co-operative Building Company, been comfortably housed, and who, by a simple and easy process, have become, or are becoming, owners of their dwellings. But most of the descriptions in this interesting little work turn rather upon a condition of society fast fading away than upon one fraught with the hopes of the future. The still lingering superstitions—the "feeling" market for the half-yearly hiring of servants against which the Free Church and Lord Dalhousie are beginning vehemently to protest,—the habit of the "Fisher Folk," and the "struggles and triumphs" of peasant poets and men of genius which Scottish story has been so full of,—all this is described vigorously, beautifully, and most instructively.

Mr. Ruskin still continues his oracular vaticinations, and his monthly confession of schemes, biographical incidents, and personal experiences.<sup>16</sup> The reader gathers by a careful study of the new numbers, that Mr. Ruskin is a violent Tory of the old school (Walter Scott's school, that is to say, and Homer's); that when he was young, he had to learn a long chapter of the Bible by heart; that his aunt gave him cold mutton for Sunday's dinner, which prevented him becoming an evangelical clergyman, as his mother would have preferred. Sir Thomas Dyke Acland and the Rt. Hon. William Cowper-Temple have consented to become trustees of the fund for founding the new Utopia, "it being distinctly understood that in that office they accept no responsibility for the conduct of the scheme, and refrain from expressing any opinion of its principle." Mr. Ruskin always combines some sterling material with his egotism, and in one of these letters says some sharp things of the intensely competitive nature of modern education. He will endeavour to enforce practically "the irrevocable ordinance that a person's mental rank among men is fixed from the

<sup>16</sup> "Fors Clavigera: Letters to the Workmen and Labourers of Great Britain." By John Ruskin, LL.D. The Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh. Printed by Smith, Elder and Co. 1871.

hour he is born; that by no temporary or violent effort can he train, though he may seriously injure, the faculties he has; that by no manner of effort can he increase them; and that his best happiness is to consist in the admiration of powers by him for ever unattainable, and of arts and deeds by him for ever inimitable."

In writing a life such as that of Josiah Wedgwood by Miss Meteyard, it must happen to the writer to have to cast aside much material that possesses intrinsic interest and also much which derives its interest for the artist only from the enthusiasm which is begotten of absorption in the individual central figure round which the useless chips are falling. Sometimes one portion of this débris may be of independent value, and such a nucleus Miss Meteyard found for her present work<sup>17</sup> in the youngest son of Josiah Wedgwood, Thomas Wedgwood, to whom, as she clearly proves, and not to M. Daguerre, the art of photography owes its birth. That M. Daguerre was acquainted with the Wedgwood family and visited Etruria is certain, indeed for some time he was in business connexion with Wedgwood, undertaking, and failing, to exhibit for sale the Etruria pottery in Paris. But he and others were sufficiently keenly on the alert to have made some effort, had it been possible, to refute the assertions made in the title of a paper published in the June number of the *Journals of the Royal Institution* for 1802—i.e., "An Account of the Method of Copying Paintings upon Glass, and of Making Profiles by the Agency of Light upon the Nitrate of Silver: Invented by Thomas Wedgwood, Esq., with observations by H. Davy." The frontispiece of the volume is a copy of the first Heliotype. Miss Meteyard says in her preface that her book concerns much more the friends of the younger Wedgwoods than themselves; and there is much matter of interest and of gossip in pages dealing with a quasi-family group comprising such names as Dr. Erasmus and Dr. R. W. Darwin, Sir James Mackintosh, Richard Lovell Edgeworth, and Sismondi; while Coleridge, Thomas Campbell, Malthus, Brougham, Sidney Smith, Wordsworth, Thomas Poole of Nether Stowey were on more or less intimate terms with them. The drawbacks to the pleasure of the reader consist in the disagreeable necessity imposed upon him of watching the gradual decadence, through neglect, of a great artistic industry, and in so outspoken and rooted an aversion on Miss Meteyard's part to Metaphysics as induces her to draw Sir James Mackintosh and even S. T. Coleridge in colours so unfavourable as to make the portraits scarcely recognisable.

It is a great misfortune that Bentham's works are less studied now by law students than they were a few years ago by the most enterprising and ambitious among them. It may, partly, be due to the substitution of the works of Mr. Mill and Mr. Austin; partly to the growing and competing attraction of Roman law. Yet it is still true, as it was at the earliest part of this century, that for precision of language, correctness of classification, and acuteness of logical vision, Bentham stands unrivalled. Among Bentham's works those published

---

<sup>17</sup> "A Group of Englishmen (1795 to 1815), being Records of the Young Wedgwoods and their Friends." By Eliza Meteyard. London: Longmans. 1871.

in French by M. Dumont are some of the most valuable. These have been more than once translated back again into English, and they will be found in Sir J. Bowring's complete edition of Bentham's works. But this edition, consisting of eleven large volumes, is far too cumbersome for the use of the ordinary student. Thus a small portable translation, such as that of Mr. Hildreth,<sup>18</sup> will be extremely acceptable to the student and the general reader. From the "Principles of Legislation" will be seen not only what was Bentham's conception of the use of "Utility" as a test, but what was the mode of applying it in detail. The "Principles of the Civil and Penal Code" will illustrate this more fully. It is to be regretted that Mr. Hildreth has not included one of the most original and valuable of all Bentham's works, "The Complete View of a Body of Legislation," as given by M. Dumont.

The translation and explanation of Gaius's Institutes of Roman Law is a peculiarly tempting piece of work to anyone who combines the qualifications of the scholar and the lawyer. The work is so complete and ornate in itself; the interest attaching to its accidental discovery by Niebuhr in the library of the Cathedral Chapter at Verona in 1816 is so romantic; and the real light the work sheds on Roman law, institutions, and general history is so bright and precious that it naturally courts the efforts of all ambitious translators and commentators. This is all the more so that the original work in its existing state presents the most irritating and tantalizing gaps, affording opportunities for endless and hopeless conjecture and ingenuity. Mr. Poste's work,<sup>19</sup> undertaken by the authorities of the Clarendon Press at Oxford, is a superior specimen of the sort of works to which this process of commentating on Gaius gives rise. Between the passages of the text, which has a readable translation in the margin throughout, is interspersed a full account, gathered from all the current original authorities, of every Roman institution, and of all the maxims alluded to. Thus the work may be taken either as a guide to these authorities, or a substitute for the study of them, according to the disposition of the student.

It would seem as though the impetus in the direction of the scientific study of law for Englishmen were destined to come from India. Professor Maine's speculations, commenced indeed before he had actual contact with the facts characteristic of native Indian society and institutions, have been largely stimulated by later official experience on the spot. Indian lawyers, again, have shown much energy in the translation of the most authoritative German treatises. The new Indian Codes, which have been created by a line of illustrious jurists, are always cited as the most successful specimens of modern codification. Thus it is not to be wondered at that one of the best works that have appeared on the subject of General Jurisprudence since the publication of Mr. Austin's lectures should proceed from the hands of an Indian

---

<sup>18</sup> "Theory of Legislation." By Jeremy Bentham. Translated from the French of Etienne Dumont. By A. Hildreth. Second Edition. London: Trübner. 1871.

<sup>19</sup> "The Elements of Roman Law by Gaius." With a Translation and Commentary. By Edward Poste, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1871.

judge.<sup>20</sup> The work is in the form of lectures. Indeed a good deal of the contents of the work formed part of a series of lectures delivered to a small class of Hindoo and Mahomedan law students in Calcutta in the year 1870. The matter treated of covers nearly all the topics with which the science of Jurisprudence is properly conversant. A knowledge of all the most recent works on the subject is disclosed by the writer and, to a certain extent, anticipated in the reader. The illustrations selected are generally very happy ones, and bespeak the lively converseance with the daily facts of human life which is the especial advantage of the practice of law. Two valuable chapters on "Liability" and on "Possession" do little more than transcribe and translate Savigny's conception of *contract* and of *possession* in all the varied senses of the latter term. But then the translation shows that the English writer has thoroughly grasped the central notions of his German predecessor, and therefore a complete and accurate account is conveyed by the translation. This is very rare in the case of translations from the German. The author dwells upon the peculiar difficulties in the way of the Oriental student addressing himself to the study of scientific jurisprudence. This study presupposes a certain amount of acquaintance with two or more different legal systems. But all the systems which are at once most complete and best organized are based on Roman law, and Indian students "can hardly be expected to make themselves generally acquainted with the Roman law." The same difficulty is, of course, experienced to some extent by English students, but the general study of Latin in schools renders the study of Justinian or Gaius comparatively easy. As English law becomes gradually codified and brought into close harmony with Continental systems, it will do much to help forward the study of general jurisprudence in the English dependencies.

The principles upon which, according to Mr. John Camden Hotten,<sup>21</sup> a law of copyright should be based, are admirably expounded in a series of seven letters addressed to the Right Hon. the Earl of Stanhope, in the course of which the past history of copyright legislation in this country is recounted, the rival theories on the subject brought face to face, and suggestions made for the amendment of the law in this country and between this country and America. The two rival claimants are of course authors, their families and assignees on the one hand, and the general public on the other. Mr. Hotten insists on the utter untenableness of the notion of any indefeasible and absolute right existing in an author to call the State to protect him and his representatives for ever in a monopoly of his works. This principle has been abandoned by the Legislature from the days of Queen Anne, when the first Copyright Act was passed. On the other hand, the absence of all protection to authors must inevitably lead to the profession of literature being abandoned by all except

<sup>20</sup> "Elements of Law considered with reference to Principles of General Jurisprudence." By William Markly, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1871.

<sup>21</sup> "Literary Copyright, Seven Letters addressed by permission to the Right Hon. the Earl Stanhope, D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S." By John Camden Hotten. London: John Camden Hotten. 1871.

the rich, or those who, from whatever cause, have small claims upon their activity as a means of acquiring wealth. But the public needs writers whose humble but useful labours are rewarded by no kind of fame, and whose only compensation is the means of subsistence provided by a sale of their productions at a sufficient price. If the price is not sufficient, the productions will not be forthcoming. As Mr. Hotten says, "Literary labour is peculiar in the fact that its humbler walks, where fame, 'the spur which the clear spirit doth raise,' is altogether wanting, are often the most useful. There are in literature, no doubt, those who 'scorn delights and live laborious days;' but there are also an infinitely more numerous class who toil in the production of works of a more solid character—books of information—books which instruct in those things which all men in civilized society should know. For this class there is no glory,—no return indeed, but the means, often scanty enough, of living and providing for those dependent upon them." Thus the true principle which, Mr. Hotten thinks, should determine the character of a law of copyright should be that which should operate as just sufficient stimulus to authors and no more. Any law which operates by giving an indefinite advantage to a long train of an author's descendants, and still more, to a long train of his publisher's descendants or successors, is, in the opinion of Mr. Hotten, a wholly unprofitable sacrifice of the claims of the public, which in all matters of law are anterior to every other consideration. Mr. Hotten complains of the existing English law of copyright that, owing to no effective mode of necessary registration being provided and, in the case of anonymous or obscure writers, the fact and date of the writer's death being often, in a high degree, difficult to ascertain, publishers have every discouragement put in the way of their republishing books of which the copyright may have long ago expired. "Under these provisions, even the Letters of Junius might to this hour be copyright. To be sure that great shadow and sole depository of his own secret would in this case be a very old man. But popular collections of remarkable cases of longevity at least record instances of much greater age than need be suffered for rendering such a fact possible." Mr. Hotten suggests that henceforth every publication should be registered; that its registration should not only be compulsory, but coincident with publication; that the term of copyright should run from that time; that to secure this registration, some penalty accompanied even by danger of forfeit of copyright, should attach to neglect; and that in the case at least of publications of which the author has thought fit to conceal his name from the world, such publications should be deprived of the benefit of the life term, and should be strictly confined to the definite period of forty-two years. Mr. Hotten gives reasons for abolishing altogether "an element so uncertain and frequently so difficult to ascertain as a life term." One of the most important letters is on "International Copyright," especially with the United States. Mr. Hotten points out in a very distinct and graphic manner how unfavourable to all the parties concerned is the existing system of publishers' mutual "courtesy," by which a publisher in the States first republishing an English work with or without

payment to the author is for ever afterwards recognised by the publishing fraternity as alone entitled to republish that work. This system has all the disadvantages, and scarcely any of the advantages of a true law of copyright.

---

## SCIENCE.

NO branch of recent mathematical research has been so immediately followed by practical and technical applications as the offshoot of modern geometry called by Monge "*Géométrie descriptive*." This is at once seen on comparing Monge's original work with the comprehensive treatise just published by Professor Fiedler.<sup>1</sup> The former is a series of problems in practical geometry, with their solution, together with the explanation of some of the abstract principles of the theory of projection—the latter, a science complete in itself, perfectly independent in its methods and aims, and resting upon abstract geometry merely as upon the foundation of its truth and legitimacy. From incidental applications of theorems to particular geometrical constructions in different branches of engineering, the aim of this collateral science of applied geometry has become nothing less than "the scientific development and thorough formation of our capability for space-conception generally"—an aim which can in future clearly not be satisfied with a mere tradition of more or less elegant methods of representing complex geometrical forms. It is fortunate that descriptive geometry has had so elevated a purpose placed before it by its modern interpreters, for there was some imminent danger of seeing it lowered to a mere mechanical accomplishment almost independent of intellectual, and more so of scientific, attainments. In accordance with these extended views the present work assigns the first place to an exposition of the mathematical principles and facts by which our conception of the various forms of space-extension is primarily guided; this purely scientific portion is placed in so lucid and vivid a manner before the reader, that the actual geometrical representation of any conception follows from it like a corollary or an incidental example. Hence, for the first time, we see here the science treated in the manner in which Logic has been recently expounded by modern writers, separating the pure *science* from the body of rules which forms the *art*, which latter rests on the former as on a foundation. Professor Fiedler gives us first a complete theory of the methods; here he discusses the general laws of central projection with their immediate consequences, the fundamental projective properties of the circle and the conic sections, the centric collineation of solid systems in space as theory of the methods of modelling, and finally the principles of orthogonal parallel

---

<sup>1</sup> "*Die Darstellende Geometrie. Ein Grundriss für Vorlesungen an technischen Hochschulen und zum Selbststudium.*" Von Dr. Wilhelm Fiedler, Professor am Polytechnikum zu Zürich. Leipzig: Teubner. 1871.

projection and their transformation, and he concludes with the problems of axonometry. In the second part the general theorems and methods find their ultimate applications in the theory of curves, developable surfaces, curve-surfaces generally, and those of the second order particularly, skew-surfaces, and surfaces of rotation. This portion the author has arranged with great originality and scientific tact; for whereas Monge and his immediate followers either lost sight entirely of the methodical and even logical unity, or at least parallelism, of abstract and descriptive geometry, or separated until very recently some chapters, which are in fact intermediate links of the chain, and assigned to them under the name of "applications" outlying positions, the author has shown that all these portions are so simply and organically interdependent and connected together into one, that pure and applied geometry really not only proceed on one and the same philosophical plan, but that they mutually lead continually into new extensions of the other. The appearance of such a work is particularly gratifying at a time when technical education is in the thoughts of public men, and it will give a new impulse to applied geometrical studies. There is not a single chapter in which practical questions and technical problems are not interwoven with, or appended to, the theory. It is written with a special view to the requirements of private students, who will find in it a rich store of exercises, either completely executed or merely indicated, together with an almost complete guide to the literature and history of the subject.

Professor Mousson's treatise on Physics<sup>2</sup> possesses not only many excellent qualities which will make it a good text-book for students, but it will also give much satisfaction to the teacher of physical science and to the professional physicist. Its most important features are—first, logical distinctness and scientific accuracy in the division of the subject; secondly, precision and comprehensiveness in every statement of laws, facts, or applications; thirdly, thorough completeness, indeed only doubtful or very unimportant facts will be searched for in vain. As a fourth and, for a text-book, very appropriate characteristic, may be mentioned the total absence of any theorizing. The author states simply what has been done, how it was done, and what results have been established beyond any doubt. All phenomena, produced by any agency whatsoever, are classed under two great heads, respectively called "General and Molecular Physics," and "Physics of the *Æther*." This latter designation appears not well chosen, and is somewhat misleading; in so far as the phenomena of Heat, Light, Magnetism, and Electricity are thus referred to what is supposed to be the cause of their correlation, no objection could be taken to such an arrangement, but to refer the phenomena to laws which govern the *æther* itself is to overlook the prominent tendency of modern inquiries to recede in the mean time from the inapproachable "*æther*," and to lay as much hold as possible of the truly molecular motions which accompany the phenomena of Heat, &c. undoubtedly,—if they do not constitute the

<sup>2</sup> "Die Physik auf Grundlage der Erfahrung." Von Alb. Mousson, Professor an der schweizerischen polytechnischen Schule. Zürich: Friedrich Schulthess. 1872.



whole of them. To give an example of the irreproachable manner in which those principal groups inclose others with their subdivisions, we select Heat. Here the phenomena are brought under two classes—viz., 1st, the mode of action of heat; 2nd, the mode of motion of heat. The first group, the action of heat, is again of a twofold kind: the state of aggregation is either not changed, or it is altered; the motion again, is either conduction, or it is radiation. The author seems to have a predilection to a dichotonous character of division; but it cannot be denied, from the example given here, that it conduces much to perspicuity and proper arrangement even of isolated facts. That the author desires to make his work as complete as possible will be judged from the fact, that even such inquiries as Fizeau's beautiful researches on the expansion of crystals, and even the most recent investigations by Bunsen on the specific heat of various bodies by means of his ice-calorimeter, are embodied in the work. The desire to introduce as much matter as possible has, however, here and there interfered with the clearness of the exposition. Thus, unless one is acquainted with the original paper of Professor Natterer, it is nearly impossible to form from M. Mousson's even detailed statements any clear idea of the highly important researches which the former has instituted into the deviations from Mariotte's law of permanent gases at very high pressures. A careful revision of the text and also of the paragraphing, which is here and there unreliable, will make a future edition a most valuable manual of Physics.

M. Lefèvre appears to have recently devoted much attention to the application of certain principles of the calculus of probabilities to the betting on racehorses, and he has published a well-digested, lucidly written essay on the subject, which in an English translation would contribute much to spread more correct views on the matter than appear to exist at present in this country.<sup>3</sup> The author has principally inquired into what may be called the fairness of the position in which the betting public generally stand to the professional bookmaker, and he comes to the conclusion that the former is placed under immense disadvantage compared with the chances of the latter. This result he ascribes principally to two causes. In the first instance, he proves from the fundamental notation of the theory of probabilities, that the value of each horse with reference to its chance of winning may be determined from the state of betting by a simple fraction, that the sum of all fractions for the horses which compose what is termed "the field," ought in all cases to be equal to unity; but that this is rarely the case, and that hence, by the absence of a clear perception of this primary principle, the public place the bookmakers invariably in the enviable position of being always winners without ever incurring even the possibility of loss. The second source of loss to the public lies in the erroneous ideas prevalent as to the real numerical value of the betting quotations. M. Lefèvre proposes as a remedy a very ingeniously constructed table, which is added to the book; its use is very clearly ex-

---

<sup>3</sup> "Le Jeu sur les Courses de Chevaux." Par H. Lefèvre (De Chateaudun). Paris. 1871.

plained, and it will probably fulfil the author's hope that it may take the same place in betting transactions which scales, yard measures, &c., have in the regulation of commercial intercourse between the public and the tradesman. M. Lefèvre's book is obviously written with a thorough acquaintance with the practical and theoretical bearings of the subject; but considered as a scientific exposition of the theoretical principles which underlie the whole, the author fails where all other writers on this subject have failed before him—viz., in not taking into proper consideration the various disturbing elements which enter into and differently modify or influence every final result of a certain combination of causes. Unless such modifying influences are all investigated independently and numerically expressed, it is clearly impossible to pronounce with scientific certainty, that under particular given conditions the probability of an event happening has this or that absolute value.

The celebrated and now considered classical papers on meteoric astronomy, which the director of the Milan Observatory, Professor J. V. Schiaparelli,<sup>4</sup> has written within the last five years, and which have given an entirely new position to the theory of meteors, have now been published in a German edition, edited by M. G. von Boguslawski, a name well known to astronomers. It is hardly necessary to point out here that the study of cosmical meteors has roused the attention of the scientific world since the periodicity of the recurrence of the November shower was once established. Since then, this neglected step-child of astronomy was brought into the foreground, and the discovery of radiating points led to a classification of the meteors into systems, while it was reserved for Schiaparelli, after once a connexion between meteors and comets was clearly traced, to be the founder of a complete astronomical theory of the meteoric phenomena. The present edition of Schiaparelli's papers, which were originally published in a somewhat scattered form in various Italian transactions not easy of access, derives additional value from the publication, in a new, altered shape, and for the first time, of Schiaparelli's original "*Note e Riflessioni sulla teoria astronomica delle stelle cadenti*."

Of Mr. Tate's "*Rudimentary Treatise on Geology*,"<sup>5</sup> the second part has just appeared, containing the section denominated that of "*Historical Geology*," as indicating the sequence in time of the various sedimentary rocks and of the igneous rocks associated with them. From the importance which Palæontology possesses in the identification of the stratified rocks, Mr. Tate is led to give a rather full sketch of the general classification of animals, and a slight one of that of plants, which will be of considerable service to the young student. The characters and distribution of the various deposits are illustrated chiefly from British examples, and in every case lists of the most characteristic fossils are given. The illustrations, although rather rough, are

<sup>4</sup> "*Entwurf einer astronomischen Theorie der Meteore, von J. V. Schiaparelli; herausgegeben von b. von Boguslawski. Stettin: Von Der Nahmer. 1871.*"

<sup>5</sup> "*Rudimentary Treatise on Geology.*" Part II. "*Historical Geology.*" By Ralph Tate. 12mo. London: Lockwood. 1871.

tolerably numerous, and the little book, although very brief, and in some points deficient, may be recommended as a cheap and good introduction to the study of geology.

Geology is also, to a certain extent, the subject of a far more pretentiously got up work, "The Subterranean World," of Dr. George Hartwig.<sup>6</sup> But here geology is only subsidiary to the author's general purpose, which is to describe in a popular form some of the most striking of geological phenomena, and especially those details of mining operations which have already received a very detailed treatment at the hands of M. Simonin and his translator. Hence he briefly notices the general facts of geology, the occurrence of fossils, the subterranean heat of our globe, and the upheavals and depressions of the earth's crust; and then passes to the consideration of the phenomena of springs, volcanoes, earthquakes, landslips, caves of various kinds, and the occurrence of remains of prehistoric man, the latter leading him to the subject of tunnels and sewers, and these again to mines and their products. The reader will easily see that this design opens a wide field for popular writing, and Dr. Hartwig has taken full advantage of it, and produced a book at least equal in instruction and interest to his former works. The illustrations are for the most part good, and well selected; they consist of three maps, showing the distribution of volcanoes and earthquake phenomena over the world, and the chief mining districts of England and America, and numerous woodcuts of fossils and views. The author has shown his good taste in avoiding those painful subjects for illustration in which M. Simonin's soul seemed to take delight; and we think he might have gone still further in this direction, and have omitted the very sensational view of the effects of the earthquake at Lisbon in 1775.

Two other books, more or less related in a general way to Dr. Hartwig's, and like it specially designed as gift-books, have just reached us, and must receive at least a passing notice. They are English translations or adaptations by Mr. Davenport Adams, of works by M. and Madame Michelet, and display in full that emotional style of poetical prose by which their writings are distinguished. One of them, "The Mountain," by M. Michelet,<sup>7</sup> is devoted to the description of mountain and ice-scenery, and takes a rather calmer and more scientific view of natural phenomena than the other, the "Nature" of Madame Michelet,<sup>8</sup> which professedly takes a poetical view of the world we live in. Both works, as far as we can judge from a hasty inspection, are of a nature to interest, especially young, or rather adolescent readers, and as far as mechanical execution is concerned, both of them are beautifully got up. The numerous woodcut illustrations, especially in "Nature," are for the most part very charming.

Another very pretty gift-book, designed for younger readers than

<sup>6</sup> "The Subterranean World." By Dr. George Hartwig. 8vo. London: Longmans. 1871.

<sup>7</sup> "The Mountain. From the French of Michelet." By the Translator of the Bird. 8vo. London: Nelson. 1872.

<sup>8</sup> "Nature; or, the Poetry of Earth and Sea. From the French of Madame Michelet." 8vo. London: Nelson. 1872.

those to whom the preceding are addressed, is the little volume on "Beautiful Birds," by the Misses Kirby.<sup>9</sup> In this we have numerous brilliantly coloured (if not always very accurate) plates of humming-birds, birds of paradise, parrots, &c., with short accounts of their natural history, written in a simple style, well adapted for the entertainment and instruction of children, and, as far as we have looked at them, correct.

It would seem that the rising generation in these islands is not destined to suffer from any deficiency of entomological pabulum. A twelve-month ago we noticed Dr. Duncan's excellent adaptation of M. E. Blanchard's "Metamorphoses of Insects," a second edition of which has just been issued; and we have now to call attention to another work of equal bulk, the "Insects at Home" of Mr. J. G. Wood.<sup>10</sup> This book, which strikes us as being decidedly the best yet produced by its very prolific author, gives a systematic account of British insects of all orders, and, as far as we have examined it, seems to be exceedingly well adapted to guide the young naturalist in his early steps on the entomological path. Of course as no single octavo volume of moderate bulk could possibly contain even short descriptions of all the British insects, it is almost unnecessary to say that Mr. Wood has been compelled to make a selection of the subjects to be noticed by him, especially as his book is more particularly intended to give an account of the natural history of the insects; but all the recognised families of insects represented in Britain are noticed, and as a general rule the selection of species to be characterized under each family has been very judiciously made. The figures with which the book is illustrated, especially those of the different species intercalated in the text, which are beautifully executed, will prove an immense assistance to the young student in the identification of his captures, and on the whole we can hardly believe that any natural-history gift-book of the present season can well bear the palm away from Mr. Wood's "Insects at Home."

Another entomological gift-book, and one of most attractive brilliancy in its outside, and in some of its illustrations, has been published by Messrs. Groombridge under the title of "Curiosities of Entomology."<sup>11</sup> This little volume contains a few short articles upon particular groups of insects or peculiar phenomena of insect life: bees, beetles, microlepidoptera, and mimicry constitute the most important subjects treated of. These articles are illustrated with plates printed in colours, and the figures, although rather crude, are generally fair representations of the objects, and their bright colours will render them attractive to many a juvenile eye. The best plates are those of the microlepidoptera and of the mimetic South American butterflies. The articles, which are anonymous, are neither good nor bad.

The Ray Society has recently published the first part of a most

<sup>9</sup> "Beautiful Birds in Far-off Lands; their Haunts and Homes." By Mary and Elizabeth Kirby. Small 8vo. London: Nelson. 1872.

<sup>10</sup> "Insects at Home, being a popular account of British Insects, their Structure, Habits, and Transformations." By the Rev. J. G. Wood, M.A. 8vo. London: Longmans. 1872.

<sup>11</sup> "Curiosities of Entomology." 8vo. London: Groombridge. 1871.

valuable treatise by Prof. Allman upon the Tubularian Polyps,<sup>12</sup> a group of animals which, although undoubtedly very low in the scale of classification, presents some of the most surprising phenomena witnessed anywhere in the animal kingdom. These polyps, as our zoological readers will be well aware, are attached by their bases to submarine objects, sometimes spreading over the surface of these like a net of roots, from which polyp-bearing stalks shoot up at intervals, sometimes forming erect branching structures, having the individual polyps at the extremities of their ramifications. But this is only one phase of their life, for whilst many tubularian polyps have fixed capsules, from which free-swimming reproductive bodies escape when mature, others produce, by a process of budding, small, transparent, bell-shaped bodies, finally provided with mouth and tentacles. In this state they become capable of leading an independent existence, and are in course of time detached from the parent stock, when they swim about freely in the sea and were long regarded as small *medusæ*. These are actually the detached reproductive forms of the polyps from which they have arisen; but the complication does not end here, for whilst in some instances the free medusoids perform the function of sexual reproduction, in others they produce by gemmation another set of bodies by which the sexual functions are exercised. This wonderful relation of the fixed polyp to the free medusæ was first clearly indicated in its bearings by Steenstrup, who described these and kindred phenomena under the name of "Alternation of Generations," in the year 1842. It was only gradually, however, that naturalists came to the conclusion that most if not all of the so-called "naked-eyed medusæ" (of the British forms of which a beautiful monograph by Prof. E. Forbes, was published in 1848 by the Ray Society) were probably to be regarded as standing in the above-indicated relation to some kind of polyps, and even at present many such free-swimming creatures are known, of whose parentage we are still ignorant. It is to the elucidation of this remarkable group of animals, the study of whose affinities and natural history is, as may easily be imagined, by no means an easy task, that Prof. Allman has devoted investigations extending over many years, and there are few indeed of our British naturalists from whom we could expect so exhaustive a treatment of the subject as from him. The British species of the group have indeed been well treated by Mr. Hincks in his "History of British Hydroid Zoophytes," published some three years ago (see *Westminster Review*, July, 1869, p. 278), but Prof. Allman goes into the subject still more profoundly, and promises to give us a systematic natural history of all the known species, foreign as well as British. In the instalment now published we have only the general introduction, in which the author describes in great detail the characters, structure, and physiology of the whole of the Hydroid polypes, an order of which the Tubularians form a very important subdivision. This portion is worked out with the utmost care and precision, and

<sup>12</sup> "A Monograph of the Gymnoblasic or Tubularian Hydroids." Part I. By George James Allman, M.D., &c. Large 4to. London: Ray Society, and R. Hardwicke. 1871.

copiously illustrated with excellent woodcuts. Accompanying the first part are several of the plates prepared to illustrate the special descriptions of genera and species which will appear in Part II. These plates, which are all drawn by the author, are admirably executed.

In Mr. Grundy's little book upon the "Food of Plants"<sup>13</sup> we have a careful summary of the phenomena of nutrition in the vegetable kingdom in accordance with the generally received views. It is written in a plain and easy manner, and furnishes a clear notion of a subject with regard to which the popular mind is generally in a rather cloudy state.

Anthropology, in one form or another, seems to be becoming an exceedingly favourite subject with a certain class of writers whom we will not quite venture to stigmatize as "pseudoscientific," although some of them undoubtedly fall under that category. We have now before us several works of which man is the subject, and which we shall briefly notice here. One of them bears the title of a "Manual of Anthropology," by Mr. Bray,<sup>14</sup> and discusses briefly the geological and zoological questions connected with the origin of man, the nature of morals and religion from a very broad point of view, and the social condition of man. The book bristles with quotations from authors of all sorts, but it also contains some original thoughts and will repay perusal.

Mr. Jackson has commenced the publication of another handbook of "Man,"<sup>15</sup> and in opposition to Mr. Bray, rather seems inclined to take the spiritual side of the question. Mr. Jackson is a phrenologist and mesmerist, and his views on the nature of man will naturally be modified in accordance with his previous studies.

Archdeacon Pratt has published a lecture delivered by him at the Dalhousie Institute, Calcutta, on Mr. Darwin's theory of the "Descent of Man."<sup>16</sup> We need hardly say that the Archdeacon dissents entirely from Mr. Darwin's views; but we must confess that his arguments appear rather feeble.

Mr. William Robinson publishes a reprint of a recent review of Sir Charles Lyell's "Antiquity of Man," and similar works,<sup>17</sup> in which he seems to fancy that he has disposed of the whole question, an opinion in which we cannot altogether agree with him, seeing that he cites only those facts which, by a somewhat one-sided treatment, he can use to his own advantage.

But the most serious of these works is the "Anthropométrie" of M. A. Quetelet,<sup>18</sup> in which the learned secretary of the Belgian Academy

<sup>13</sup> "Notes on the Food of Plants." By Charles C. Grundy. 12mo. London: Simpkins. 1871.

<sup>14</sup> "A Manual of Anthropology, or Science of Man, based on Modern Research." By Charles Bray. Small 8vo. London: Longmans. 1871.

<sup>15</sup> "Man, contemplated Physically, Morally, Intellectually, and Spiritually." By J. W. Jackson. Part I. 8vo. London: James Burns. 1871.

<sup>16</sup> "The Descent of Man, in connexion with the Hypothesis of Development." By John H. Pratt, M.A., &c. 8vo. London: Hatchards. 1871.

<sup>17</sup> "Flints, Fancies and Facts," a Review of Sir C. Lyell's "Antiquity of Man," and similar works. By William Robinson, of Cambridge. 8vo. London: Longmans. 1871.

<sup>18</sup> "Anthropométrie, ou mesure des différentes Facultés de l'Homme." Par A. Quetelet. 8vo. Brussels: C. Muquardt. 1870.

publishes the results of his long-continued researches into the statistics of the measurement of man, and shows how all human phenomena may be reduced to a mean represented by a binomial curve. This work, which contains a number of tables giving comparative measurements of the body and its parts, in various races of men, will be found of great importance to the student of art.

We have also to notice, as a useful introduction to the knowledge of human anatomy and physiology, a little work on the "Wonders of the Human Body," translated from the French of Dr. A. Le Pileur.<sup>19</sup> This work is very nicely got up and well illustrated.

---

We owe to Helmholtz, the greatest of living physicists, the discovery of the ophthalmoscope. By this instrument we are enabled to look at the termination of the optic nerve, and to explore the whole of the fundus oculi. It is obvious therefore that it is a most valuable aid to the ophthalmic surgeon. He can often *see* the cause of his patient's blindness, and therefore obtains precise indications for treatment. But since affections of sight occur very frequently from disease of the brain, and in cases of disease of the kidneys and other important organs, physicians also are in debt to Helmholtz. Dr. John W. Ogle has the great merit of being the first English physician to draw attention to this new means of research in medical cases. For several years past Dr. Clifford Allbutt, of Leeds, has written papers which show convincingly the great value of the ophthalmoscope in physicians' practice, but which have also added greatly to our knowledge of several very serious diseases. In the book<sup>20</sup> before us he brings together the work which has been done by others in medical ophthalmoscopy, and at the same time gives us very numerous and original observations of his own. It is not possible in the space at our disposal to give an analysis of the book. But we wish very earnestly to recommend it to the attention of those physicians who desire to study their patients' illnesses thoroughly and precisely. Its value is that it places the reader *au courant* with the present views, but a still greater merit is its method. We do not use the word method in the sense of mere arrangement; we mean that kind of order which is only found in the work of the highest class of minds. He does not only speak *on* the ophthalmoscopic appearances; he speaks *from* them to disease of the most important organ of the body; he tells us about a wise meaning they have. We must add that the author shows the great characteristic of power; he gives credit most generous to others. So much so that a superficial reader, who had not before studied the subject, would fail to perceive how highly original the author's work is.

The announcement of a work on "Pulmonary Consumption" by

---

<sup>19</sup> "Wonders of the Human Body." From the French of A. Le Pileur. Small 8vo. London: Blackie. 1871.

<sup>20</sup> "On the Use of the Ophthalmoscope in diseases of the Nervous System and of the Kidneys; also in certain other general Disorders." By Thomas Clifford Allbutt, M.D. London. 1871.

Dr. Williams, was received with much interest by the profession, and we are bound to say that these anticipations, high as they were, are amply justified in the volume before us.<sup>21</sup> A book on this disease may be written from two different points of view—from that of the physician who practises the art of medicine, and from that of the experimenter and reasoner who investigates the scientific data upon which the practice of his brethren must be founded. These two functions may be combined in the same person; and in any case a highly efficient practitioner must have that familiarity with the work of scientific investigators, which is necessary for the success of his own applications of a doctrine which at present is constantly changing. That Dr. Williams would bring forward the results of a practical experience which few or none of his contemporaries perhaps could equal, was to be expected, and it was to be expected, moreover, that he would set these forth as a man of candour, acuteness, and steady judgment. It was scarcely anticipated, however, unless it were by Dr. Williams's own personal friends, that to these claims upon our attention he would add those of a thinker familiar with the most recent researches and speculation. The very maturity which enables a man to unfold, as Dr. Williams does, an experience of nearly half a century in the treatment of the most terrible of English maladies generally brings with it also that fixity of opinion and that closure of the hardening brain against new impressions and new ideas which tells against him in the more speculative part of his subject. Here younger men have often the advantage of their elders. Most fortunately Dr. Williams has retained that mental flexibility and openness to new teaching which enables him to speak authoritatively from both points of view. Had we now the space to review the work before us we should find much to provoke discussion and no doubt to provoke some dissent, but there would be no grounds to accuse the author of old-worldliness or of ignorance of the recent labours of such men as Niemeyer, Villemin, Sanderson, and others. It is the best possible answer to those paradoxical talkers who would have it that medicine has done nothing to prolong human life, to quote the comfortable words of Dr. Williams, who says that in the "far greater number of cases much may be done to mitigate, to prevent, to retard, aye, and even to arrest and cure, this most destructive of human maladies." Dr. Theodore Williams has ably assisted his father in writing some principal parts of the treatise. The preface contains a dignified remonstrance against the aimless ways of too many patients, who in their fickleness and curious search after new things throw away their best hopes of relief.

"Dynamics of Nerve and Muscle"<sup>22</sup> is one of the books that seem at first sight to command our convictions, so full is it of the results of hard work, directed by keen insight and ready in-

<sup>21</sup> "Pulmonary Consumption." By C. J. B. Williams, M.D., F.R.S., and C. T. Williams, M.D. London: Longman & Co. 1871.

<sup>22</sup> "Dynamics of Nerve and Muscle." By C. B. Radcliffe, M.D., &c. London: Macmillan. 1871.



genuity, so eloquently does every page tell of the industry and accomplishments of the learned author. Moreover the conclusions of Dr. Radcliffe are simple, striking, readily intelligible, and seem at once to solve many physiological riddles. Yet the very caution and *εὐροχη* which distinguish Dr. Radcliffe himself in all that he writes will be our justification if we refrain a while from giving our adhesion to his views. The subject, as Dr. Radcliffe will be the first to admit, is too difficult and too extensive to allow of rapid conversions, and we have enough to do intelligently to thank such a philosophic and thorough an observer as Dr. Radcliffe and to master the contribution he has made to the subject in hand without going farther as yet. The volume before us, though full of physiological and clinical discussion treated with an ability as rare as the caution with which they are expressed, yet admits of its main points being put very succinctly. Dr. Radcliffe has to account for the well-known contractility of muscle fibre and for the nerve endowment which controls it. This contraction of muscle which we see daily in normal action is, nevertheless, he says, a phenomenon of the same kind as the spasm of disease and the rigor mortis of death—the highest attainment of life in muscle is extension; every contraction even in the normal state is so far a diminution of this full life, and spasm and still more rigor mortis are the results of a morbid diminution of life down to the stage just anterior to decomposition, when of course new conditions exist. The explanation Dr. Radcliffe gives of these changes is, that the electricity of the muscular fibres is static and not current as is generally supposed, that the charge is kept up by the continual supply of healthy blood and that every contraction, normal or other, is accompanied by a discharge of static electricity. The mode of accumulation, say in a voluntary muscle, is that the sheath acts as a Leyden jar, each side of which is charged with opposite electricity; if then the sheath is assumed to be elastic its opposite sides will tend to approach one another and the fibre will, by a squeezing process, be lengthened. Under normal circumstances of course this discharge is made by the nerve fibre. The chief clinical deduction from this theory is that, as a plentiful supply of good blood tends to heighten the charge and lengthen muscle, so spasm will be found to consist in a diminution of such blood; spasm, therefore, is no more to be regarded as the "over-action" of a bloodshot tissue, but as the tendency to death as a consequence of anæmia. That spasm and pain are always consequences of anæmia and never of vascular injection will, we think, be contested by other observers on rather strong grounds, and the discussion of this question cannot but be full of interest and profit. As it is, some of Dr. Radcliffe's clinical arguments seem a little constrained, though expressed in all cases with the utmost reserve. Excellent as this work is we ought not, however, to refrain from saying that the theory seems to us to present many difficulties; indeed we think no theory of muscular contraction satisfactory which does not explain the contractility of the undifferentiated protoplasm of amœba.

It would have been difficult to find two better men as editors of the systems of surgery and medicine than Mr. Holmes and Dr.

Russell Reynolds.<sup>23</sup> They are both men of liberal education, of wide experience, and possessed of those personal qualities which best attract and secure the aid of their professional brethren. If, then, there be any failure in these works, regarded as complete systems good in detail and good as wholes—and some failure we must reluctantly say that there is—we shall attribute it rather to the necessary difficulties of the task itself than to any shortcoming in the editors. Such difficulties are made especially apparent in the volume now before us, and in his preface Dr. Reynolds hints at the nature of them, though he is too courteous to express any annoyance. It is not hard to understand, however, that work promised has failed to appear, that engagements undertaken have not been fulfilled, so that it has been necessary to make an abrupt change in the course of the work. It must, moreover, be very difficult to lay down any rigid rule for the guidance of writers of the learning and standing of those who contribute to these volumes. Each man writes on his own subject in his own way, somewhat regardless of the relation borne by his own sections to the essays of others, and thus contradictions, omissions and repetitions occur which are perhaps unavoidable and of which therefore we can say no more save this, that we hope in new editions, when each writer has been a reader of the whole, some more uniform result may be obtained. The present volume of course varies in the excellence of its parts, but on the whole contains much valuable matter. If the work of some contributors smells of the lamp, that of others is pregnant with personal observation and suggestive reasoning. The large majority of the *Essays* are excellent, and many, if not most of them, like the admirable *Essay on Pneumonia*, by Dr. Wilson Fox, have an original character. Among those of an opposite kind we are sorry to see the *Essay on Phthisis* by Dr. Hughes Bennett, which strikes us as being hasty and defective in many ways. It is somewhat egotistic in tone without being original, and in its rather querulous and inadequate estimate of the labours of others it compares very unfavourably with the work of Dr. Williams of which we have spoken in very different terms. We should have been glad if Dr. Bennett had used the present opportunity to add to his deservedly great reputation. Altogether, however, this volume is a very useful one, and if not the best possible is nevertheless very welcome, not only for present purposes but also as a standard for the future.

The two handsome volumes, the titles of which are given below, with a third containing *Clinical Lectures on the Diseases of Women*, will form an excellent edition of the complete works of the brilliant physician and teacher who has so recently been taken from us.<sup>24</sup> So full of bright and

<sup>23</sup> "A System of Medicine." Edited by J. Russell Reynolds, M.D., F.R.S. Vol. III. London and New York: Macmillan & Co.

<sup>24</sup> "Selected Obstetrical and Gynecological Works of Sir James Y. Simpson, Bart., M.D., D.C.L., &c." Edited by I. Watt Black, M.A., M.D.

"Anæsthesia, Hospitalism, Hermaphroditism, and a Proposal to Stamp out Small-Pox, &c." By the same. Edited by Sir W. G. Simpson, Bart. Edinburgh: A. and C. Black.

restless energy was Sir James Simpson that his death seems even yet to have caused a silence in the land, and these volumes come at this time most opportunely to fill the blank caused by his absence from among us. As we turn once more over the remains of his eloquent and ingenious protest concerning "Hospitalism"—for remains assuredly they must appear to all who heard the living words from his own lips—we seem to see the bland and humorous face, the keen watchful eye and the quiet mellow voice, as he met his opponents at the Leeds meeting of the British Medical Association, fronting their generous heat with his quiet persistence and imperturbable persuasive manner. We need not now recall the details of the argument so lately heard from his own lips. The collection of his papers on Anæsthesia have more value than some might think. Besides the interest we have in reading the master's own words, and besides the curious interest we find in going over those old battles which now that they are won seem silly enough, on one side at least, but which were merely a phase of the recurrent follies of men armed with the bungling weapons of an effete theology (for on such grounds of benevolence versus Scribes and Pharisees it actually was that Simpson had his hardest battles to fight)—apart from all this, we say, there is still much instruction to be found in reading of anæsthesia as it appeared to one who, if not its discoverer, was at any rate its founder. His arguments and his suggestive handling of the matter may even to-day be read with profit by the most distinguished of his followers. The essay on Hermaphroditism will find its readers rather by its place as a standard treatise upon a curious subject which will be consulted continuously by the few, than as a popular treatise to be read by many at once. Not much editing was required for this volume, but it is carefully arranged, and both volumes are well got up by the publishers. When we turn to the first volume we find the various obstetrical essays of the author collected and arranged, and they seem to cover a more uniform field than might have been expected, so that with the forthcoming third volume we shall have a fairly comprehensive body of doctrine. Simpson's work was too daring and tentative to serve as food for students, but his pages will for this reason be the more valuable to those cultivated and experienced readers who are able to read them with discrimination. We should scarcely ourselves have printed the lecture notes which open the first volume, as they seem to form an index or syllabus for young students rather than a collection of suggestive notes for his own inspiration. In all other respects Dr. Black has every claim upon our thanks.

Dr. West's Lectures<sup>25</sup> did not appear to advantage in the weekly journals, as their merits are of so unobtrusive a kind that he who runs with restless eye as he reads may well fail to discover them. For it is in a certain kindly and cultivated style, in the concealed art of a quiet, unforgetful experienced observer, and in the chastened thoughtfulness and in-

<sup>25</sup> "On some Disorders of the Nervous System in Childhood." Being the Lumleian Lectures for 1871. By Charles West, M.D. 8vo. London: Longman & Co.

sight of a clinical physician and children's friend that these merits lie, and not in striking originality or in the self-asserting incisiveness of a keen and positive reasoner. Hence they are to be enjoyed in a tranquil way, for manner as well as matter, though matter is not wanting—to be enjoyed, that is, something as Watson's lectures are enjoyed, with a pleasure not commonly to be found in medical writing. We would confidently advise all physicians to buy these attractive lectures, for modestly as they are put forth there is not one of us, however well up in modern work, who will not be the better for these pleasant words from the well stored mind and quiet acuteness of a physician who "has lived among children and has loved them as we all learn to love the objects by which we are daily surrounded," and who has daily seen and ministered with sympathetic hand and heart to their suffering and their sorrow.

Dr. Chapman's pamphlet of sixty-four pages is intended to give in a handier form the results of his observations which were published in a larger volume already known to the profession.<sup>26</sup> It contains also some newer matter taken from stores of more recent growth. To review the pamphlet is practically therefore to review the whole subject, which, however, it were impossible to do in this place. We have no hesitation in saying that Dr. Chapman's treatises are worthy of the most careful consideration. His statements may be divided into two kinds: first the speculative which deal with the construction of his important hypothesis; secondly, those of fact which have an independent value. As to the latter, it is impossible for us either to accept or to reject them, as we have not the means of verification, but the observations seem to us to have been very carefully made, to carry the appearance of truth with them, and to rest not on the testimony of one only but of many competent persons. And this being so, they are important enough to claim the most serious attention, for the cases recorded are very remarkable and ought to be either admitted or rejected for good reason. As to the hypothesis, we should have much to say did space permit, but we would not omit to point out that the value of the results obtained is quite independent of the theory which suggested the treatment, and which may be true or false. At the same time the theory is worked out logically and temperately and certainly seems to be "a key" which "unlocks the secret" of the morbid phenomena far better than the crude humouralism of Dr. Johnson, which seems to be the principal rival hypothesis.

In Balaustion's Adventure we have all been reading of the vanquishing of death by the strong arm of Herakles; a nobler fight was being fought under our own eyes, and one was rescued by the subtle skill of medicine whom death had surely marked for his own. This is no hyperbole, for not a more inspiring episode have we read for some time than Dr. Fox's stand-up fight with death,<sup>27</sup> contesting every inch of ground with

<sup>26</sup> "Cases of Diarrhoea and Cholera treated chiefly by means of the Spinal Ice-bag." By John Chapman, M.D. London: Baillière and Co.

<sup>27</sup> "On the Treatment of Hyperpyrexia." By Wilson Fox, M.D. London and New York: Macmillan and Co.

faithful perseverance until by sheer pertinacity he won the day, using the weapon not of enchantment, nor of brute force, but of keen intellect pitted, as Dr. Huxley would say, against the great Chessplayer who never makes a mistake. It has been known for some time that patients sick of a high fever all tend to death in a somewhat similar fashion, and further investigation has shown that the fatality of fevers bears not an absolute but a very near proportion to their height as measured by the thermometer. Thus death by fevers is shown in most instances to be due not to special but to more general causes, to correspond with and indeed actually to be death by heat stroke. This is especially true of certain cases of acute rheumatism, and these cases have been invariably fatal if the temperature has reached and maintained a height of  $106^{\circ}$ — $107^{\circ}$  Fahr., death being due to the directly lethal influence of the excessive heat upon certain of the tissues of the body. The application of this is that the temperature must be lowered if these tissues are to be spared, and cool bathing is one of the means by which this is to be done. These facts stated now so shortly and seeming now so obvious, have only been recently discovered and brought to the proof by the earnest labour of English and German physicians, and it is Dr. Wilson Fox's merit that he has by patience and minute technical care used these observations to save life in those cases of acute rheumatism which, if unchecked, destroy it so rapidly. In addition to the thermometer, Dr. Fox made use of another instrument of precision—the sphygmograph; but for the detail of his manœuvres and of the cases themselves we must refer to his interesting little book, which with others like it makes a brilliant time in the history of positive medical science and art.

The little books of this quarter run the large ones hard in point of merit, for if they show lesser efforts, some of them are in every other respect full of value. These lectures of Dr. Russell Reynolds<sup>28</sup> are no mere *rechauffé* of common electro-therapeutics; on the contrary they are fuller of matter than we anticipated, and, though pleasantly colloquial, are not by any means to be called slight in their substance or style. Dr. Reynolds is not only well up in the newest things of electro-therapy, but he has assimilated the more valuable of them, and all that he has read is evidently received not into a passive mind but into a mind already well-stored with experience and well-disciplined by thought and careful observation. Hence it would be difficult to put a more useful volume into the hands of the student or of the practitioner, it being at once readable and thoroughly scientific. And this is a great gain to the profession, for while on the one hand we were disposed to deprecate the handbook treatment of a subject as yet so immature, until we had seen how fairly well this has now been done; on the other we have felt keenly how lamentable is the ignorance of this potent remedy even among eminent and skillful physicians. It is not given to all consultants to read and digest large volumes written in various tongues, still less to read and compare a number of such

---

<sup>28</sup> "Lectures on the Clinical Uses of Electricity." By J. Russell Reynolds, M.D., F.R.S. London: Churchill.

volumes, which in great measure are controversial and tentative. Those who have the time for serious study are in many instances engaged in other investigations, and for these and for busy practitioners, who are unable to master even the treatise of Althaus, these brief and popular lectures will be quite a windfall. In any case however electro-therapy must, for a while at least, be practised chiefly by those who have made it a special study; so potent a remedy cannot be used without danger by those whose habit it is to content themselves with what they call "expectant treatment." Electricity will not lend itself to happy-go-lucky methods without taking a revenge which will be scarcely pleasant to think of, if it becomes more and more a "fashionable remedy."

Dr. Pullar deserves the thanks of the profession for his translation of Dr. Neumann's "Textbook,"<sup>29</sup> a work of great usefulness, and one which gives in a compendious and intelligible form a kind of knowledge which is not to be had elsewhere. We do not hesitate to say that the present volume is more useful as an exponent of the views of the school of Hebra and of the work done by that school than the translation of the treatise of the master himself. Dr. Neumann's handbook presents the faults as well as the virtues of the Hebraists in strong relief, and shows us on the one hand how narrowing is the pursuit of a very special study, and on the other how valuable researches may be which are painfully elaborated within a very limited circle. Dr. Neumann has given us the latest and best results which have been obtained by close and microscopic investigation of the skin throughout all its morbid changes—results which remind us of the labours of many other excellent persons upon the Diatomaceæ, and which bear about the same relation to any larger conceptions of disease which the latter do to philosophic zoology. Nothing can be more excellent than the author's descriptions of the very changes themselves as they are seen in the skin—nothing can be more inadequate than his views of skin diseases in their relation to diseases elsewhere. He seems never to have formed the idea that diseases occur in series having a fundamental affinity which is to be detected by tracing the morbid phenomena in the life history of individuals and in the stem history of families. What place skin diseases may take in such series, and how they are associated with other phases of pathogenic development, we have yet to learn, and in this search neither Dr. Neumann nor Hebra himself give us the least assistance. But as we have said, we are thankful for results which in themselves are so valuable and show so much industry and care; no dermatologist should be without the book on his shelves. The woodcuts are numerous and very beautiful, though some of them are either much worn or badly worked off. The book itself also is badly printed; we presume that it was important to produce it as cheaply as possible.

We are not surprised that a new edition of Dr. Duncan's valuable

---

<sup>29</sup> "Text book of Skin Diseases." By Dr. Isidor Neumann. Translated by Dr. Pullar. London: Hardwicke. 1871.

work is called for, as it is one of a kind which is far from common.<sup>30</sup> The writer is learned and laborious, but perspicuous and concise cise withal—a combination of qualities which is precious, for statistics are too often found together with dulness and prolixity. A man who sees clearly before him and who is quick in reasons and ideas is too often without taste for the compilation of the materials of which his conceptions should be built up; thus we have too often clever writers who are inaccurate, and plodding writers who may be accurate but who are certainly tedious. We cannot pretend to have so searched into all sources of error as to be able to guarantee that Dr. Duncan's tables are in every instance trustworthy and well sifted, but we can certainly promise the reader that he will find them drawn up with much discrimination and the data arranged with a clearness which commands our confidence. We do not see one set of conditions muddled up with others of a different order, but, on the contrary, the various categories are sharply defined and are marshalled in series which are distinguished with a logical precision amounting to subtlety. We speak of books of this kind with much interest, as we hold that the numerical method is the only foundation upon which we can rely for the elimination of accidental elements and for the establishment of the science of medicine upon a durable and exact system. We cannot now enter into the numerous questions of which Dr. Duncan treats so skilfully and which seem in his hands to be now provisionally settled—settled until some equally honest, industrious, and acute physician appears to contest them. With respect to one question of general interest, which of late has caused some anxious discussion, we may say that Dr. Duncan fixes the average mortality in childbed of mothers delivered at the full time to be 1 in 120. The chapter on this difficult inquiry is a good specimen of the author's method.

We do not know what the influence may be, but some cause there is which favours the development of handsome books upon diseases of the kidney. That books on renal diseases are much needed even yet, and that able observers should direct their energies into a field of work which promises so well, is not a matter of surprise; but in addition to this we have to thank these authors for the pains and cost which are not spared in the publication of their results. Well printed and beautifully illustrated, Dr. Grainger Stewart's volume<sup>31</sup> claims a place beside the work of Dickenson and worthily follows the finely illustrated essays of Dr. Bright himself. Of the merits of Dr. Stewart's work we spoke on the appearance of the first edition; it is written from first-hand knowledge, and is indispensable to the student, who needs all the help to be had from those authorities who have had large experience in the wards and in the dead-house, and who know so well how to turn it to good account. We had expected a little more from the Second Edition than we actually find, for several questions have lately come forward which need a more adequate handling. We had hoped, for in-

<sup>30</sup> "Fecundity, Fertility, Sterility, &c." By J. Matthews Duncan, M.D. Second Edition, revised: Edinburgh: A. and C. Black.

<sup>31</sup> Bright's Disease of the Kidneys. By T. Grainger Stewart, M.D., &c. Second Edition. Edinburgh: Bell and Bradfute. London: Longmans.

stance, to have had Dr. Stewart's valuable opinion regarding the alleged hypertrophy of the muscular arterioles—whether, that is, this increase in their size, which has been long known, is an actual increase in true muscle, as is more recently asserted. We think again that the author has not made it clear enough that the cirrhotic kidney is but one factor in a general tissue change which is of the highest interest both in itself and in comparison with other forms of systemic failure. This narrowness of view makes itself felt also in the somewhat inadequate section on the treatment of this state. Dr. Stewart still holds to the truth of the distinctions between renal diseases first proposed by Virchow, and thinks that the apparent confusion between these several forms is dissipated by close and accurate comparison.

Dr. Bateman's volume is the work of an honest and industrious man, if not of a vigorous and thoroughly trained reasoner.<sup>32</sup> We may call it therefore a useful book, but not an excellent one. The illustrative cases are not always compared happily, nor does the author quite grasp the subject he has in hand. For example, on p. 71, the author writes that "the faculty of speech is special and independent and may perish alone," and he then proceeds to inquire what part of the brain was injured in the case he had previously related. He thinks "we may assume that the disease was limited to the convolutional grey matter." Now if the author had had the faculty of second sight he would have foreseen that he was about to write on p. 178, "that I by no means consider it proved that there is a cerebral centre for speech at all, and I would venture to suggest that speech, like the soul, may be something the comprehension of which is beyond the limits of our finite minds." It is difficult to set these sentences together; it is more difficult to know what is meant by "the faculty" of language; and it is most difficult of all to know why if Dr. Bateman thinks his own subject to be past comprehension he should have taken the trouble to write upon it. We who hold a different view of the matter may however read Dr. Bateman's pleasant little book in spite of the author himself.

This essay<sup>33</sup> obtained the Hastings Medal of the British Medical Association, which not only does honour to the author but also to the donor, for if the prize calls forth work so original and so thorough as the present it is a more valuable foundation than such prizes usually are. Dr. Fothergill's essay does not give us the notion of being written to order, but might well have been the spontaneous utterance of a man who had studied a certain question long and closely and had something to say about it. The author must be an observant and an industrious as well as a learned physician, and we find this additional pleasure in his essay, that he publishes it in the belief that it may aid in diminishing the hopelessness with which diseases of the heart are too commonly regarded from a therapeutic point of view. Dr. Fothergill supports the opinion now held almost universally by competent

<sup>32</sup> "On Aphasia, or Loss of Speech." By Frederick Bateman, M.D. Svo. London: Churchill. 1870.

<sup>33</sup> "Digitalis: its mode of Action and its Use." By J. Milner Fothergill, M.D. London: Lewis.



observers—namely, that digitalis is strictly a cardiac tonic. He gives his grounds for accepting this opinion, and shows how this precious virtue of the drug may be turned to the best advantage in different cases, not only of heart disease but of syncope from other causes. We should have been glad if he had made more use of the sphygmograph as an instrument of precision, and we hope that at some future time Dr. Fothergill will distinguish for us those cases in which digitalis seems at first sight the proper remedy, but in which it fails and disappoints us.

The history of the Welsh Fasting Girl, her life, her notoriety and her end, has been embodied in a small volume by Dr. Fowler,<sup>34</sup> a volume which contains also the depositions before the coroner and the report of the evidence given at the trial of the parents. As a trustworthy record, by a competent writer, of the wretched and ignorant curiosity of modern men and women who claim to live in a scientific age, it will have perhaps as much value as the history of Mary Tofts, the rabbit-breeder. In addition to this, however, we are glad to see the reports of a *cause célèbre* put into a permanent shape, and we have also some comments by Dr. Fowler himself and the record of some physiological experiments upon a young woman dying of starvation. It is perhaps well that a man of Dr. Fowler's ability was not too fastidious to deal with so miserable a matter; for he has succeeded in giving some scientific interest to the subject by comparing these observations of the illness of Sarah Jacobs and of the post-mortem examination with those made in other cases of starvation.

We see by the title-page of this brochure on "Spiritualism and Animal Magnetism," that its author is a lecturer on the history of art at South Kensington.<sup>35</sup> We hope that he talks less nonsense at Brompton than he does in his book, which, for a small one, seems to contain an amount of rubbish which is quite astonishing. Because our life is "mysterious," it is therefore given to Professor Zerffi to be mysterious too; and because he disbelieves in the supernatural theories of "animal magnetism" and uses a scientific jargon, he conceives that he is free to spin any sublunary hypotheses at will. What are we to think of a writer who simply takes for granted that a young lady in Russia was cured of lung consumption by a mesmeric sleep of nine days, induced at her own request?

---

<sup>34</sup> "A Complete History of the Case of the Welsh Fasting-Girl, with Comments." By Robert Fowler, M.D. 8vo. London: Renshaw. 1871.

<sup>35</sup> "Spiritualism and Animal Magnetism." By Professor Zerffi, Ph.D. London: Hardwicke.

## HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

IT is seldom that a writer so devotedly studies the character and literature of a foreign nation as M. Taine has studied ours, and the phenomenon is as valuable as it is rare.<sup>1</sup> A work like M. Taine's performs, so to speak, the part of a contemporary posterity. It enables us to survey our own literature from a point of view which we could not reach ourselves. The original work has now been some years before the world, and is known and admired in this country; the present edition in an English dress will render M. Taine's work more accessible than it has hitherto been. The translation is scholarly and spirited, and has clearly been a labour of love. The translator's notes are always interesting, and M. Taine's quotations have been collated and verified by Mr. Van Laun. Where the author has been obliged to use a French version, the translator has given the original passages. This first volume brings the reader to the beginning of the third book of the French work, and concludes with an estimate of the dramas of Sheridan and Colman. A second volume in which a complete index is promised, will contain the history of our contemporary literature, and the well-known chapters on Macaulay, Mill, and Tennyson. But though so long a period is dealt with in this first volume, there is no portion of the subject which is entirely neglected. The early Saxon literature can scarcely be called English in the sense in which we speak of English literature after the time of Chaucer. The fierce battle songs, the intemperate theological formulas, the meagre historical entries will interest the philologist and the ethnologist, but they bear the same relation to the literature of the country as interjections and ejaculations do to language—they fructify with a literature only when they are joined to the polite culture of the Norman conquerors. The beginning of English literature is translation from the French. Such works as the "*Voyage and Travaile of Sir John Mandeville*," the chronicles of Wace and Gaimar, hint at the gradual victory which the Saxon speech was to win over the Norman. That victory is already won when *Piers Plowman* relates his vision on the Malvern Hills. M. Taine well points out that in Chaucer first, literature becomes self-conscious of its own existence. The warriors of the Heptarchy, the knights of the Middle Age had produced no work that reached this point. "They had strange emotions, tender at times, and they expressed them, each according to the gift of his race, some by short cries, others by continuous babble. But they did not command or guide their impressions. Here for the first time appears a superiority of intellect, which at the instant of conception suddenly halts, rises above itself, passes judgment, and says to itself 'this phrase tells the same thing as the last—remove it; these two ideas are disjointed—bind them together; this description is feeble—reconsider it.' When a man can speak thus, he is on the brink of

<sup>1</sup> "*History of English Literature.*" By H. A. Taine; translated by H. Van Laun, with a Preface by the Author. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas. 1871.

independent thought and fertile discovery; this was Chaucer's position." But literature does not spring into being full grown; its growth is gradual. Chaucer's writings have the vigour and innocent wantonness of happy youth; his voice is not firm. "It is," says M. Taine, "like that of a boy breaking into manhood: *L'accent mâle et ferme se soutient d'abord; puis une note grêle et douce vient d'indiquer que cette croissance n'est pas achevée, et que cette force a des défaillances.*" It is the time of bright promise rather than of manly accomplishment. And never was intellectual vigour more needed than when the English mind began to throw off the trammels of scholastic subtlety which had so long enmeshed it. The appalling industry of Duns Scotus, who died at the age of thirty-one, and left twelve folio volumes upon such questions as these: Whether God can know more things than he is aware of?—whether a glorified body can occupy one and the same place at the same time as another glorified body?—whether the dove in which the Holy Spirit appeared was a real animal—is but a type of the bondage under which the English mind laboured. This must all be broken through before literature could rise fresh and free in the strong youth of the English renaissance. M. Taine calls this the pagan renaissance of the Saxon genius. It was at least better that the literature of the country should be filled with allusions to classic beauty and grace than that it should be choked and suffocated with the Arabian sophistries of the schoolmen. These allusions are at first too frequent and far-fetched. The scholarly verse of Surrey is cold and artificial by reason of this failing, yet it heralds the approach of freedom. At the end of his century all was changed; the Euphues of Lyly marks the change. "Our nation," says Edward Blunt, "are in his debt for a new English which hee taught them. All our ladies were then his scollers; and that beautie in court who could not parley Euphuesme, was as little regarded as shee which now there speakes not French." But the rough spirit of the Saxon remains in spite of all. Sir Philip Sydney, the gentle, stately knight, the poet of this period, writes to his father's secretary:—"Mr. Molineux, if ever I know you to do as much as read any letter I write to my father without his commandment or my consent, I will thrust my dagger into you. And trust to it, for I speak in earnest." Poetry was like strong wine in those days, and went with action. Says Sir Philip, speaking of his tumultuous Arcadia:—"It is a trifle; my young head must be delivered." M. Taine contrasts this healthy desire for utterance with the fever which raged in the blood of De Musset, Heine, Poe, Shelley, Byron, and Cowper. Other names might be added. But the time was healthy and strong too. It is the time of Drayton, Green, Donne, Spenser, Ben Jonson, Suckling, and Herrick, and is drawing on to the time of Shakspeare. Before dealing with Shakspeare, M. Taine speaks of Spenser, whose poem he says is a phantasmagoria, but such that all the beauties of delicate Celtic fancy, and of German epic poetry, together with the barbaric splendours of the East, are harmoniously united therein. "Thus a beauty issues from this harmony, the beauty in the poet's heart which his whole work strives to express, a noble

and yet a laughing beauty made up of moral elevation and sensuous seductions, English in sentiment, Italian in externals, chivalric in subject, modern in its perfection, representing an admirable and a unique epoch, the appearance of paganism in a Christian race, and the worship of form by an imagination of the North." From Burton of the Anatomy, and Sir Thomas Browne, M. Taine hurries on to Bacon, "the most comprehensive, sensible, originative mind of the age;" and leaves him to deal with that special product of the *renaissance*—the Theatre. It is not altogether a pleasing picture, if it be a true one, which M. Taine draws of the English character, to which this theatre had to appeal. The fierce Scandinavian element had not died out then, if it has now. Rough language and ready blows were the characteristics of the people to whom Shakspeare was soon to speak. And, indeed, Mr. Froude tells us much the same thing, and the contemporary chronicles are not exempt from the national sternness. Holinshed says, after a list of what look very like murders: "Also the one-and-twentieth of the same moneth for the same cause, doctor John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, was beheaded for denieing of the supremacie, and his head set upon London Bridge. The Pope had elected him a cardinall, and sent his hat as far as Calis, but his head was off before his hat was on, so that they met not." The men, then, who were to be the dramatists of the nation, were sprung from the people, and reflected their modes of thought. Such were Marlowe, Massinger, and Jonson, and however violent and outspoken they were, it was by them that art was insensibly formed. Jonson brought dramatic art to great excellence, and all that it lacked of perfection was to be given it by his friend Shakspeare. "So now, at last," says M. Taine, "we are in the presence of one whom we perceived before us through all the vistas of the *renaissance*; like some vast oak to which all the forest ways converge; in order to take him in completely, we must have a wide and open space." But it must be admitted that when M. Taine writes of Shakspeare, he is not so happy as when he is dealing with other authors. The wonder is that a Frenchman should be able to write of him at all with any approach to calm criticism. By some peculiar destiny of the French mind, it would seem fated that no Celt should be able to speak with moderation of our great poet; either, like M. Voltaire, he is doomed utterly to fail in reaching an appreciative estimate, or, like M. Hugo, to run into the opposite extreme, and in a series of epigrammatic and pyrotechnic sentences to show that he has lost the just and indispensable poise of a Shakspearian critic. M. Taine unites both characteristics of a faulty critic. He is at times inappreciative, he is at times brilliantly enthusiastic; he is seldom just. Of course we are speaking with reference to his criticism of Shakspeare. An Englishman may trust the works of Shakspeare with a German, or with an American like Professor Lowell, but it is questionable whether any Frenchman has as yet given us anything of value concerning Shakspeare. And yet M. Taine's method should have led him to better results, if it be the right one. Like Buckle, he begins with a study of the epoch, and then proceeds to an estimate of the man. Yet, when we have read his

chapter on Shakspeare, we have learnt nothing—at least, we are no nearer the poet. Take the following summary :

“ We pause stupefied before his convulsive metaphors, which might have been written by a fevered hand in a night’s delirium, which gather a page full of ideas and pictures in half a sentence, which scorch the eyes they would enlighten. Words lose their sense, constructions are put out of joint, paradoxes of style, apparently false expressions, which a man might occasionally venture upon with diffidence, become the ordinary language : he dazzles, he repels, he terrifies, he disgusts, he oppresses.”

Is this in any sense a just criticism of Shakspeare ? Can it teach us at all to estimate him at his true value ? Does it not rather express the morbid impression which his works might make upon a mind to whom the *Henriade* was familiar, and to whom Shakspeare came as a stranger ? In writing of the Christian *renaissance*, which M. Taine makes to succeed the pagan *renaissance*, he is far more just. Milton, “ who found himself at the confluence of two civilizations,” is better treated. For M. Taine’s criticism the spirit of the age is the guiding star, and Milton, however pre-eminent, was more closely connected with the spirit of his age than Shakspeare was with that of his. When a critic has thoroughly mastered the thoughts that animated Puritanism, it is not difficult to be just to the greatest of the Puritans. In the classic age which follows, M. Taine deals with Dryden, Wycherley, and Congreve, in the same appreciative spirit that marks the early part of his book. Sheridan is the last great name that attracts him before the decline of the drama ; but with the decadence of the Court the genuine drama and the genuine comedy pass from the stage into books ; family life begins, and the novel takes the place of the theatre. M. Taine has caught but little of the English style from his study of English literature. Perhaps it is better so. We are judged from without, and by one who is certainly not of ourselves. His view of our literature is new and strange, and these characteristics make it valuable. He paints minutely and with pre-Raphaelite accuracy that which strikes him ; as an artist who travels in a foreign country may surprise its inhabitants by the faithful representation he gives of their customs and peculiarities. But M. Taine’s work serves to show how much more there is than the “ silver streak of sea ” which separates us from our neighbours. He has been with us without being of us. And it is perhaps noteworthy that the *avertissement* which he prefixes to Mr. Van Laun’s book is written in French and not in English. The work is dedicated to M. Guizot.

This is not M. Guizot’s only point of contact with England. We are glad to see a translation of his “ History of France ”<sup>2</sup> appearing in English. The monthly parts, of which there are to be twenty-four, have already reached the seventh or eighth issue, and are illustrated by M. de Neuville. The story is well fitted for schools or families, though it is not likely to carry the history beyond the year of the Revolution, 1789.

<sup>2</sup> “ The History of France from the Earliest Times to 1789.” By M. Guizot. Translated from the French by Robert Black, M.A. London : Sampson Low, Marston, Low, and Searle. 1871.

Fourteen years ago, there appeared the first edition of a work<sup>3</sup> in reference to the Provincial Assemblies and the administrative divisions of 1789. It has now reached a second edition, and is increased in bulk and importance. The point of view which it takes is different from that assumed by M. Léonce de Lavergne upon the same subject, since it treats chiefly of the administrative functions of the Assemblies. Much has been added in the body of the work, and the last two chapters are almost entirely new.

It is pleasant to remember that, however the nations may be confounded by wars and tumults, the steady progress of science does not depend upon the regularity of any country's development. Ten years after the French Revolution, the Royal Institution of this country was established. Its foundation was a good augury for the nineteenth century; for there are few institutions of this century which have had such great names connected with their founding as that of which Dr. Bence Jones gives us the history.<sup>4</sup> The Royal Institution, which owes its origin to the extraordinary and original genius of Count Rumford, which heard in its infancy the lectures of Dr. Garnett, Dr. Young, Sir Humphry Davy, Sydney Smith, Coleridge, Landseer, and Flaxman, and afterwards of Faraday, may, in spite of its youth, compare with any institution in Europe for the splendour of its names and the brilliancy of its achievements. It may fairly be considered at the head of those institutions which have had, as it were, a spontaneous origin, and have been unsupported by the patronage of the State. Mr. Herbert Spencer says of it very justly, in the December issue of the *Fortnightly Review*, "From this, which is a product of altruistic co-operation, and which has had for its successive professors, Young, Davy, Faraday, and Tyndall, there has come a series of brilliant discoveries which it would be difficult to parallel by a series from any State-nurtured institution." It is, however, with the *early* history that Dr. Jones professes to deal, and he closes his work with the death of Sir Humphry Davy, in 1829. Count Rumford, the founder of the institution, was born in Charlestown, in 1753, and was made a Count of the Holy Roman Empire by the Elector of Bavaria, in 1791. Five years later, he published the theory, which has since become so well known, that "Heat is Motion." This theory arose from his observation of the heat evolved in the mechanical process of boring cannon at Munich. The whole course of his scientific career is well told by Dr. Bence Jones. The design of the institution was made public in 1799. In June, 1801, Davy was made lecturer in chemistry to the institution, and in the same year Dr. Young, who had already discovered the law of the interference of light, became professor there. The story of Dr. Young's life is one of the most interesting that could be told. Master of almost the whole range of knowledge in literature, science, and art, a brilliant discoverer,

<sup>3</sup> "Les Assemblées Provinciales sous Louis XVI., et les Divisions Administratives de 1789." Par Le Vicomte de Luçay. Deuxième Edition. Paris : Georges de Graet. 1871.

<sup>4</sup> "The Royal Institution. Its Founder, and its first Professors." By Dr. Bence Jones, Honorary Secretary. London : Longmans, Green & Co. 1871.

and a polished man of society, he yet failed to attract such an audience as Davy, "and for no other reason," says Dr. Paris, "than that he adopted too severe and didactic a style." In 1802 Davy was elected professor of chemistry. Dr. Jones is the biographer of his life. The account of his chemical experiments and discoveries will well repay perusal. Six years after his appointment, he succeeded in decomposing, by the use of galvanic batteries, the two fixed alkalis, soda and potash, which up to this time had resisted the efforts of the most eminent chemists who had attacked them with all the methods at their command. During some part of his time Davy was associated with Faraday. Of Davy, Coleridge said, "Had he not been the first chemist, he probably would have been the first poet of the age."

We will now turn to another branch of literature. Whatever may be the opinion entertained by any reader of Mr. Kavanagh's book,<sup>5</sup> in reference to his professed discovery of the origin of languages, there can be but one opinion as to the style and spirit in which that book is written. And if Mr. Kavanagh is desirous, as he professes to be, of promulgating a theory which at least runs counter to received opinion, he is by no means happy in his method of inducing belief. Mr. Kavanagh seeks to give credit and validity to his opinions upon philological matters by a wager of a thousand francs against one hundred that he has discovered the origin of language. This wager he proposes that M. Littré, the French lexicographer, should accept. The present work, however, is not Mr. Kavanagh's first appearance as a philologist. He tells us in his introduction that fourteen years ago he published a work entitled "Myths traced to their Primary Source through Language." This book it has not been our lot to meet with; a circumstance which we less regret, inasmuch as Mr. Kavanagh has a habit of repeating himself, and nothing that we have seen in the present volumes disposes us to wish for a nearer acquaintance with the earlier work. He refers also to a book which he wrote in 1844, and claims even then to have made his great discovery. As he himself asserts that many of his previous derivations were extremely bad, and admits that he then knew very little of the origin of language, it may be hoped that the time will come when he will speak of the present volumes with the same just modesty. We fear, however, that the majority of Mr. Kavanagh's readers will be deterred from seriously considering the theory which he so noisily sets forth, both by the reckless and intolerable etymologies with which he follows it up, and by the unmeasured abuse with which he attacks his reviewers. The gentleman whose misfortune it was to review his earlier work in the *Athenæum* he designates "a low, lying driveller, with a just sense of his own vile character;" "a mendacious reviewer," "a sorry dolt," "too contemptible to-deserve notice," and "a rogue of a reviewer." Yet, unpleasant reading as this vituperation is, we must confess, in spite of all consequences, that we prefer it to Mr. Kavanagh's etymologies.

The fourth volume of the Venetian Calendar<sup>6</sup> extends over the period

<sup>5</sup> "Origin of Language and Myths." By Morgan Kavanagh. Sampson Low, Son and Marston. 1871.

<sup>6</sup> "Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts relating to English Affairs, exist-

from 1527 to 1533, a period most interesting to historical students, for it includes the fall of Wolsey and the divorce of King Henry VIII. And in the notices which appear in the present volume are recorded some circumstances in reference to these events which have not received the attention they deserve. The diaries of Sanuto, from which many of the notices are taken, extend to the end of September, 1533, and Mr. Rawdon Brown, in the excellent preface with which the fourth volume opens, takes his leave of the diarist as he "would from a valued friend and companion with whom he has communed for more than 37 years." These diaries, in the Library of St. Mark's, Venice, consist of fifty-eight folio volumes, and were written by Sanuto for the benefit of future generations, as he told his friend Bembo, when he delivered them for custody into the chamber of the Council of Ten. And there are few European countries whose annals have not been enriched with extracts from them: the present volume contains many. Sanuto appears to have copied down almost everything that came to his hand, and amongst other things the letters that reached Venice from England, so that we are enabled to trace the fate of Wolsey from his glory to his decline. The volume begins with the account of a banquet which the Cardinal gave, and at which the King was present. Casparo Spinelli, the Venetian Secretary in London, writes to his brother Ludovico, Jan. 4, 1527:—

"Last evening I was present at a very sumptuous supper given by Cardinal Wolsey, there being amongst the guests the Papal, French, and Venetian Ambassadors, and the chief nobility of the English Court. During the supper the king arrived with a gallant company of masqueraders, and his majesty, after presenting himself to the cardinal, threw a main at dice, and then unmasked, as did all his companions. Supper being ended, they proceeded to the first hall, where a very well designed stage had been prepared, on which the cardinal's gentlemen recited Plautus' Latin comedy, entitled 'The Menæchmi.'"

The rest of the pageant was scarcely such as we should have expected at a Cardinal's entertainment. Letters from London detail the course of the proceedings for the King's divorce, with many interesting particulars which we cannot quote. There come to us, too, from these Venetian papers, hints of social discontent and commercial agitation. In March, 1530, Falier writes from London to the Signory: "Some apprentices, under pretence of playing a cudgel-game, took up arms; it is said they intended to kill our merchants because, as they export the English wools, the people have no employment. The Mayor went to the spot and arrested sixty of the rioters, so that the disturbance ceased." Dated Dec. 2nd, we find a letter from Scarpinello to the Duke of Milan, announcing the death of Wolsey. With this we shall close our quotations from the Calendar:—

"According to report his mind never wandered at the last; and on seeing Captain Kingston he made his attendants raise him in his bed, where he knelt,

---

ing in the Archives and Collections of Venice and in other Libraries of North Italy." Vol. iv. Edited by Rawdon Brown. Published by the authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. London: Longman & Co. 1871.



and whenever he heard the king's name mentioned he bowed his head, putting his face downwards. He then asked Captain Kingston where his guards were, and being answered that lodging was provided for them in several chambers on the groundfloor of the palace, he requested they might all be sent for into his presence. So as many having entered as the place would hold, he raised himself as much as he could, saying that on the day before he had taken the sacrament, and expected soon to find himself before the supreme judgment-seat, so that at such an extremity he ought not to fail speaking the truth, or leave any other opinion of him than such as was veracious;" [adding] "I pray God that sacrament may be to the damnation of my soul if ever I thought to do disservice to my king."

The book concludes with an admirable general index.

The period of which we have been speaking synchronizes with a historical event of great importance—the conquest of Peru by Pizarro. The adventures of Cortes and Pizarro filled Europe with the wonderful story of far western civilization—a story that lost nothing in the telling. But for historical reference, no writer on this subject has been so frequently used as the Ynca Garcilasso de la Vega.<sup>7</sup> His position was a peculiar one. Being on his mother's side of the Peruvian blood royal, and on his father's belonging to a noble Spanish family, he became acquainted from his earliest years with the languages and customs of Spain and Peru. At the age of twenty he left America for the former country, and finally settled down in Cordova, where he died at the age of seventy-six. His pride in his connexion with the royal dynasty of Peru, his interest in the traditions of his race, and his intimate acquaintance with the Quichua language, induced him to write an account of Peruvian civilization, far more complete than has been given by any other writer. The first part of this work, under the title *Commentarios Reales*, appeared in 1609 at Cordova. It is the work which Mr. Markham has now translated for the Hakluyt Society. De la Vega's information comes in a great measure from his own personal knowledge, but he has added many things which he learnt from the mouths of his Indian friends and kinsmen. Mr. Prescott, no less than other historians of Peru, makes frequent use of this work, quoting De la Vega, according to Mr. Markham, eighty-nine times. It has been translated into French, German, and Italian, nor is this its first appearance in English. It was translated (very badly) in James II.'s reign, by Sir Paul Rycant. "No one," says Mr. Prescott, "who reads the book will doubt his limited acquaintance with his own tongue, and no one who compares it with the original will deny his ignorance of Castilian." Mr. Markham's work is of another kind; it is the first good representation of the chronicler in English, and the translator's knowledge of the Quichua dialect enables him to keep pace with the Indian author.

The wonderful stories which came from the New World gave a great impetus to maritime adventure. Mr. Kirke's book<sup>8</sup> brings be-

<sup>7</sup> "First Part of the Royal Commentaries of the Yncas." By the Ynca Garcilasso de la Vega. Translated by Clements R. Markham. London: Printed for the Hakluyt Society.

<sup>8</sup> "The First English Conquest of Canada." By Henry Kirke, M.A., B.C.L. Oxon. London: Bemrose and Sons. 1871.

fore us, in striking pictures, the bold and intrepid enterprise of our earlier merchants. The merchant-service, in the latter half of the seventeenth century, attracted the younger sons of country gentry and the cadets of noble houses. All the world was stirred with tales of travel. Mr. Kirke quotes from Colonial papers, in the Record Office, the description of those "banqueting houses built of crystal, with pillars of massive silver, some of gold," which were supposed to adorn the El Dorado of the West. And so the merchants sailed with boundless expectations into the very fogs and mists of Acadia and Newfoundland. The French, however, were the first colonists of Acadia, or Nova Scotia as it was afterwards called, and Jacques Cartier was the name of the leader of the first expedition. Slowly and with difficulty the French established themselves at various points along the coast, and traded with the natives for fur and skins. Port Royal, Quebec, and the parts round Canseau were some of their first settlements. The Royal Charter, granted in 1627, seemed likely to establish their prosperity upon an increasing and permanent basis, when a squadron of English vessels, under Captain David Kirke, changed the prospects of the French colonies on the banks of the St. Lawrence. The war which now broke out between England and France seemed an opportunity both for the extension of English commerce and the destruction of French power in the West. Charles I. looked with favour upon the project, and founded as an encouragement the order of knights-baronet of Nova Scotia, to consist of all gentlemen who were willing to settle in that country. He gave to them and to their heirs male the privilege of wearing and carrying about their necks an orange-tawny silk ribbon with accessories. This appendage proved eminently attractive, and a small fleet was fitted out by Sir W. Alexander. Of this fleet—only three ships—Captain David Kirke was admiral. He carried letters of marque under the King's broad seal, which gave him authority to drive away the French settlements in Nova Scotia and Canada. This squadron had not arrived at Newfoundland when the French dismissed another fleet under the command of M. de Roquemont. It was a more formidable armament than Captain Kirke's, and consisted of twenty vessels carrying 150 pieces of ordnance, to be mounted on the walls of Quebec. The two fleets met off Cape Gaspé. De Roquemont refused to surrender, and an engagement took place, in which Captain Kirke's ship captured that of the French Admiral, who was thus taken prisoner. The rest of the fleet surrendered. Upon the news of this misfortune to their compatriots, the garrison at Quebec, under M. Champlain, were in despair, for the attacks of the Iroquois and their own want of provisions had brought them to the verge of ruin. In Paris the French satisfied themselves with burning effigies of Captain Kirke and his brothers amidst the tolling of bells and the yells of the populace. Meanwhile Captain Kirke, who was by no means affected by the indignities which the Parisians had offered to his effigy, was fitting out a larger and better equipped fleet, which was to sweep away the remaining settlements of the French from the Canadian shores. With this fleet he eventually took Quebec, and its commanders became his prisoners. These

prisoners he treated with great consideration and humanity, though they were difficult to please. One of them, De Caen, was a notably surly fellow, who complained of his "diett;" yet when it was demanded "whie he did not take his diett with the maister of the house, who had divers times invited him, offering him the freedom of his house and garden, he answers that he loved his private." There were difficulties too about his "linnen," for he appears to have dreaded the expense of a laundress. But he would pay no ransom, "and should they keep him ten yeares and ten yeares, he was altogether unable to pay a ransom, and wished that noe man would judge of his estate by his ellingant clothes." Sir David Kirke, who was now permitted to wear the "orange-tawny ribbon," himself tells the story of the dealings with the Indians of Newfoundland. The King seems to have given but little encouragement to these mercantile enterprises, for he surrendered Quebec to the French almost immediately, in spite of the protest of Sir D. Kirke. The character of Sir David comes out in striking colours in this interesting little book. He was far-seeing, practical, and, save for the "orange-tawny ribbon," unrewarded. The readers of this book will have become acquainted with a brave, humane, and honourable man.

There are before us several interesting works by Indian commissioners. First in importance is Mr. Bowring's book, admirable for its clear direct style<sup>b</sup> and the amount of knowledge it communicates. Mr. Bowring succeeded Sir M. Cubbon as commissioner in the important districts of Mysore and Coorg. Few people in England know that Mysore is the second in rank of her Majesty's feudatory dominions, with an area of twenty-eight thousand square miles, and a population of four millions. The Mysore names best known here are probably Seringapatam and Bangalore; but the whole district is interesting. Mr. Bowring tells us of its products and resources, and the report is a pleasant one. Mr. Bowring tells us very little of his own successful rule, though we should gladly have heard it. Four or five years ago there was much discussion in Parliament with regard to a question of privilege in Mysore. The question was whether the Raja of Mysore, who had been deprived of sovereign power, should be allowed to adopt an heir. The Raja was a man of great natural intelligence, of unbounded and extravagant generosity, but his weakness of character led to his downfall, and justified the action of Government. For the remainder of his life he lived in empty state, receiving visitors with extreme pomp and ceremony, and endeavouring as far as he could to bring about his restoration to power. He did not succeed in this, though one concession was made by the Government; it was the one of which we have spoken. Mr. Bowring thinks that the permission to adopt an heir was both wise and prudent. At the age of seventy-four the Raja died. He was succeeded by Chamragendra, at present a boy of about eleven or twelve years of age. It is gratifying to learn that the British Government has taken every precaution to insure a

<sup>b</sup> "Eastern Experiences." By L. Bowring, C.S.I. Late Chief Commissioner of Mysore and Coorg. London: Henry S. King. 1871.

becoming education for the young chief, and to avert from him the ignoble fate of the late Raja. Coorg is even a more interesting province than Mysore. It is small, but the inhabitants are athletic, gallant, and loyal. No Coorg man voluntarily leaves his mountain home; and the Coorg people are treated with exceptional indulgence by the Government. They themselves voted the annexation of their territory to the British crown in 1834. This vote was the result of the intolerable cruelties of the late Raja. Amongst other instances of his barbarities, it is said that there is in his courtyard the figure of an elephant of life size; to this figure he caused prisoners to run from their place of confinement across the yard, whilst he from a balcony fired at them as the poor wretches sped. To increase the excitement of this royal sport, it is said that he promised to spare their lives if they touched the elephant. He was, however, so excellent a shot that the victims rarely escaped. The language used in Coorg is a dialect of Kanarese. The people of all these districts of Southern India belong to the race which is called Dravidian, and which is said to be more closely connected with the Teutonic races than the rest of the Indian races are. Mr. Bowring's portion of the book closes with an account of his visit to the Taipings in 1854. It is followed by selections from Mrs. Bowring's letters and diaries under the title of "Chit-chat with Friends at Home." These pleasantly record a lady's impressions of the scenes in which her husband was prominently engaged.

Captain Harcourt's book<sup>10</sup> takes us into a different portion of India. In the Himalayan districts, where he acts as commissioner, the people appear to be mixed races, and to have a distinct tinge of Chinese and Thibetan blood. Captain Harcourt is more descriptive than historical, and aims at giving an account of the people and country as they are. The scenery is excessively beautiful, and the people, though addicted to deceit and evasive practices, not without good qualities. Indeed, Captain Harcourt has much to say for them, especially for the people of the Spiti division, and indignantly repudiates the character given them by Dr. Gerard, who asserts that they are "black, greasy, and imbecile, without any noble qualities whatever." The religion of the country is more marked by traces of serpent-worship than that of any other Indian district. Captain Harcourt thinks that when Buddhism began to spread, the old serpent-worship, India's primitive religion, took refuge in the valleys of the Himalayas. He asserts that in some of these valleys there are temples dedicated solely and simply to the honour of the serpent—a fact not generally known. The book throws light upon a region little visited by Europeans, and one where the government, until lately, has been mainly carried on by native officials.

Another commissioner, Sir George Jacob, furnishes us with a useful and interesting work<sup>11</sup> upon the north-western provinces of the

---

<sup>10</sup> "The Himalayan Districts of Kooloo, Lahoul, and Spiti." By Capt. A. F. P. Harcourt, Bengal Staff Corps, Assistant Commissioner, Punjab. London: W. H. Allen and Co. 1871.

<sup>11</sup> "Western India, before and during the Mutinies. Pictures drawn before

Indian peninsula. Sir George's book gives his readers a vivid conception of the difficulties which beset, even in times of peace, the Indian political commissioner. Questions of succession and of legal redress involve the government in difficulties of which the British public seldom hear. The native of these provinces seems, from Sir George's experience, to be remarkably liable to fraud and corruption, and to have but a low opinion of British justice. Sir George himself says (p. 122): "Our system is unsuited to the Oriental mind, except where imbued with Western ideas, as in the Presidency towns, though even here it is no safeguard for the poorer classes. 'Throughout the interior the masses dread our courts and their processes, and many a wrong is endured rather than seek a redress through them.'" Sir George was forty years in India, and he speaks of the natives in a kindly and considerate spirit. Indeed the enthusiasm which induces so many victims to perish beneath the wheels of Juggernaut, and the devotion which lends a mystic rapture to the Suttee, are forces which, if properly regulated, would place the people who possess them high in the list of nations. Sir George, in his long career, seems never to have forgotten this. We advise our readers to peruse his account of the last authorized Suttee in Kutch, a perusal which we recommend the more inasmuch as Lord Dalhousie overlooked this incident in his *précis* drawn up on leaving India. The latter part of the book gives an account of the mutinous discontent in the Western provinces, and the history is brought down to the date of the Queen's proclamation on November 1, 1858. Sir George is an Indian officer of the old type, and seems to fear a too rapid progress in Indian reforms; but he tells us that the Queen's proclamation was received with demonstrative enthusiasm, and that its spirit, if acted upon, is likely to prevent the recurrence of the painful events of 1857-58. We cannot leave this book without a word of commendation for the fresh and pleasant style in which it is written. There are very few indications that we owe this volume to one who speaks of himself in the dedication as a "blind and infirm old man."

Two books<sup>12 13</sup> upon the late Continental War have reached us. Herr Rüstow's first volume has been translated into English, and our military men under the new army system cannot do better than study it. It shows clearly the truth of what Mr. Gladstone has asserted, that war in the future is to be a contest of the intellect as well as of brute force. For those officers who are unacquainted with German—and how large a proportion do they make!—Mr. Needham's translation will be eminently useful. Colonel Rüstow, the author, has gained a distinguished reputation upon the Continent by his writings on military subjects.

---

Life." By Major General Sir George Le Grand Jacob, K.C.S.I., C.B., late Special Political Commissioner, Southern Mahratta Country. London: S. King & Co. 1871.

<sup>12</sup> "The War for the Rhine Frontier, 1870." By W. Rüstow, Colonel in the Swiss Army, formerly Captain in the Prussian Army, &c. Translated from the German by John Layland Needham. Vol. I. William Blackwood and Sons.

<sup>13</sup> "Geschichte des Krieges von Deutschland gegen Frankreich in den Jahren 1870 und 1871." Von Julius von Wicked. Hannover: Rümpler. London: D. Nutt. 1871.

His works, as a historian, are marked by accurate special knowledge and impartiality, characteristics which appear in this present history. It opens with an account of European affairs from 1866 to 1870, and clearly traces the causes of the last conflict. The chief was this: the Empire, weakened from the Mexican war, and unable to recover itself by the complete establishment of a constitutional government, trembled at the growth of anti-imperial tendencies throughout the country. Military glory gained under its auspices—glory of all things the most dear to the French character—was now the only remaining remedy for the tottering Empire. With this object in view, it had from the end of the Austrian war looked forward to a conflict with Germany as the means by which its prestige was to be regained. But France, in her restless eagerness, overlooked the calm and serene development of German resources which was progressing unknown to her beyond the Rhine. She forgot that the admirable system of organization with which she was to contend was no new and sudden discovery of German professors, but the growth of long years; and when the clash of armies took place, astonishment was mingled with her despair. Nothing is now so astonishing as the ignorance of her deficiencies with which France rushed into the contest, unless it be the reticent self-reliance of Germany. Said Marshal Leboeuf to the Emperor, "Sire, not a single trousers-button is wanting." Colonel Rüstow shows how mere a pretext the Spanish throne question was. No one in Germany believed that a war could arise from it, yet on the 14th of July war was declared. He points out in two admirable chapters the contrast between the French and German armies, the deficiencies of the French system, and the rapidity with which the mobilization of the German army was effected. This first volume brings events down to the 18th of August. It is to be hoped that Mr. Needham will shortly complete the work that he has commenced. Herr von Wickede gives a very complete account of the war. His work is written in a lively and popular style, and the arrangement of his materials resembles that of the work we have already mentioned. It lacks the calm historical impartiality of Colonel Rüstow's book, though few will quarrel with it for its loyal imperialism.

Two works of different kinds, but both by late Fellows of Trinity College, Oxford, shall occupy us next. Mr. Freeman has certainly done well to republish in this form<sup>14</sup> the valuable essays which he has from time to time contributed to the *Fortnightly* and *Quarterly Reviews*. Most of them will be known to our readers, but in their present shape they are accessible and convenient. This volume is a selection of twelve articles, partly on English subjects, and partly on events of early European history. His essay upon the "Early Sieges of Paris" was published a year ago, when it was peculiarly opportune; but like the rest of the essays, it may be read again with interest. In the last essay, written so far back as 1864, Mr. Freeman weighs, without arriving at a decision, the advantages and disadvantages of a Presi-

<sup>14</sup> "Historical Essays." By Edward A. Freeman, M.A., D.C.L., late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. London: Macmillan and Co. 1871.

dential Government. We hope that Mr. Freeman will see fit to follow up this volume by a further selection from his lesser writings. We shall welcome the republication of his article upon the Morality of Field Sports.

The theological school at Oxford<sup>15</sup> is calling into existence a curriculum which shall unite historical with theological study. To this circumstance is owing the present work, under the editorship of Mr. Haddan and Professor Stubbs. The exigencies of that school have rendered it desirable to publish this third volume at once, although the second has not yet appeared. It deals with five centuries, including the whole Anglo-Saxon period from the Mission of Augustine until the Norman Conquest, and forms a complete history of the Anglo-Saxon Church. The materials are clearly arranged, and the notes admirable. The book will be welcomed by the historical reader as well as by the theological student. In some cases the original documents conferring the rights and privileges of sees and monasteries are given, and where the dates are uncertain the probabilities are learnedly argued. The work issues from the Clarendon Press, and its excellence is guaranteed by the name of the Professor of Modern History. Briefly we may say that it is one of those great works which require special study, and which are not within the sphere of ordinary criticism.

Five more years will bring us to the centenary of Chief Justice Lefroy's birth, and it is only two years since his death. He was born a quarter of a century before the union of Ireland and England, and he almost saw the disestablishment of the Irish Church. In the present volume his son is his biographer. Thomas Langlois Lefroy<sup>16</sup> was descended from a family who left Cambray during the persecutions of the Duke of Alva. His father was colonel of a regiment stationed in Ireland, and sent his son at the age of fourteen to the University of Dublin. There under the care of Dr. Burrows he made great proficiency in the studies of the place, taking the highest prize of each year, and the gold medal of his class. In 1795 he left the university, and four years later he married Miss Paul, daughter of Jeffry Paul, Esq., of the county Wexford. His biographer says that they were married at Abergavenny, in North Wales (evidently a misprint for South Wales), where many of the Irish gentry sent their families at the outbreak of the Rebellion. About this time Mr. Lefroy was called to the Irish bar, but three years elapsed before he began to attend the courts. In 1800 he argued a writ of error before the Dublin Exchequer Chamber with such success that his name is mentioned with commendation by Lord Redesdale, Chancellor of Ireland. Yet although everything promised him success on circuit, he preferred to settle down to Equity practice,

<sup>15</sup> "Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland." Vol. iii. Edited by A. W. Haddan, B.D., and W. Stubbs, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History; formerly Fellows of Trinity College, Oxford. At the Clarendon Press. 1871.

<sup>16</sup> "Memoir of Chief Justice Lefroy." By his Son, Thomas Lefroy, M.A., Q.C. Dublin: Hodges, Foster & Co. 1871.

and in 1808 he was appointed a King's serjeant. Three times he refused a puisne judgeship, though as King's serjeant he had frequently to serve judicially on circuit. The first time he was called upon to take this position was in 1822, a critical period, when the spirit of rebellion was rife. Shortly after the Duke of Wellington's accession to power, commenced the agitation for the Catholic Emancipation Bill. Mr. Lefroy was protestant of the Protestants, and opposed by all means in his power this measure of religious liberty. His speeches upon the subject made him extremely unpopular, and although it was universally admitted that he had exercised his judicial functions with unimpeachable justice, the Lord-Lieutenant deemed it advisable, in the existing circumstances of the county, to interdict his further exercise of those functions. Upon this Mr. Lefroy resigned his professional position. In 1830, however, he was returned to Parliament as member for the University of Dublin. In Parliament he vigorously opposed the Reform Bill, and indeed all the measures of Reform which came before the House during his membership, which ceased in 1841, when he became one of the Barons of Exchequer. He had expected the Irish woosack, and his disappointment was bitter. The lower office he held until he was ninety years of age, in spite of the attacks of some Liberals, who, in 1866, objected to his retaining it at his advanced age. Notwithstanding the extreme narrowness and bigotry of his religious opinions, it may fairly be said that they give the chief interest to his life, for they were sincere and honest. As a politician he consistently opposed every movement in the direction of Reform, and he had the mortification of seeing that his opposition was, in every instance, unavailing. The length of his life aided his reputation—a reputation which the present volume will scarcely avail to sustain. A large number of letters upon trivial domestic incidents which his biographer publishes, are without general interest. But there are many things in the book which will repay perusal.

Eight years<sup>17</sup> before the birth of Chief Justice Lefroy was born John Hookham Frere, a Tory of the same type as the Chief Justice, but of a much more lasting reputation. Since it is his literary reputation by which he will be chiefly known, we shall not speak at length of his political career, which was by no means successful. As the friend of Pitt and Canning, and as Minister to Spain and Portugal, he had opportunities of distinction in the political sphere which might have made him famous if his powers lay in that direction. But they did not. He was eminently a literary man, and by his literary works he must be judged. Nor are these of the first order. Yet it may be said that he was first in the second rank of literary men. As a translator of Aristophanes he is unequalled by any translator of that writer in any language. Students of Aristophanes during the last fifty years have come across quotations from his unpublished versions of the Athenian poet, and have longed for the privilege of seeing the whole work; stray copies of unattainable plays have tantalized the admirers of his trans-

---

<sup>17</sup> "The Works of John Hookham Frere." With a Prefatory Memoir by his Nephews, W. E. and Sir Bartle Frere. London: Pickering. 1871.



fusing power, but it is only now for the first time that his works have been collected and offered to the public in Mr. Pickering's two magnificent volumes. There can be no pleasanter reading for a scholar and a Tory this winter than the works before us. The scholar who is not a Tory would be content to have Mr. Frere's translations without the memoir, and we hope that another edition will bring the Aristophanic portion of the work, unencumbered by the political poems, into the reach of a wider circle than that to which it is now alone open.

Two books,<sup>18 19</sup> if we may venture to leash together works so different, from two nations, offer a remarkable contrast. Herr Roesler's book is scholarly, profound, and admirable. Of the other work we cannot speak so favourably. Herr Roesler deals with an ethnological question of some importance in a learned and historical spirit. The question is, the historical descent and importance of the Roumanian race. Herr Roesler disclaims any political *arrière pensée*, and argues the subject upon historical grounds. Whatever conclusion the reader may come to, he will admire the learning and cogency of the arguments which Herr Roesler adduces. Several chapters are given to the discussion of the origin of the Getæ, the Dacians, and the Hungarians, and the book closes with an appendix relating to the Magyar and Moldavian nationalities. Of the second book of this pair it is difficult to speak, inasmuch as the author's point of view is utterly opposed to that of all men of letters. It is the work of one who has determined beforehand to show, both that we owe nothing to the ancient Greeks and that philhellenism is a vice based upon ignorance. This ignorance he strives to remove by a sketch of Greek history from the earliest times to the present day, and under his pen it must be confessed that history assumes a new and unpleasant character, the Persian wars lose their importance and heroism, the Athenian democracy becomes a fastidious and arbitrary episode in the history of an insignificant state, and the communism of Sparta an elaborate institute for the practice of cruelty and lust. Greek sculpture and Greek literature fall before the iconoclastic hands of the "ancien diplomate," and of all we have loved and learnt from these there is nothing left which we can admire or desire. It is only fair to the ex-diplomatist to state that in dealing with later times he is more correct and even more picturesque in his statements, but his book will not make one convert or convince one mind.

There is very little left for us to notice. Mr. Middleton, the author of our next book,<sup>20</sup> would possibly in an earlier age have gained for himself renown as a bold and fearless sailor; in these days he is compelled to satisfy himself with such glory as can be won from a single-handed voyage round England. Those readers who were interested

<sup>18</sup> "Romänische Studien, Untersuchungen zur älteren Geschichte Romaniens." Von Robert Roesler. Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot. London: D. Nutt.

<sup>19</sup> "Les Grecs à toutes les Époques." Par un ancien Diplomate en Orient. Paris. 1870.

<sup>20</sup> "The Cruise of the Kate." By Empson Edward Middleton, Author of the First Two Books of the Æneid of Virgil in Rhymed Verse. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1871.

in the story of the "Rob Roy Canoe" will be interested in this book. Mr. Middleton accomplished his cruise in a yacht twenty-three feet long, and the log of the cruise is upon the whole pleasantly kept. It would be better, however, if the author omitted his discussions on subjects of social and political economy. The literary character of the book is poor.

Mr. Michell describes in a series of poetical pictures<sup>21</sup> the most famous men and women of ancient times, and closes his characters with poems upon Wolfe and Napoleon I. The phraseology is correct, but we should have deemed the work unattractive had we not known from the advertisement that Mr. Michell finds it desirable to publish a cheap edition of his collected writings.

---

## BELLES LETTRES.

THE author of "Episodes in an Obscure Life" has certainly not gone back. Many writers attain a sort of flash-in-the-pan reputation by their first production. In an evil hour either their own vanity or the publisher urges them to write again in raw haste. This however is certainly not the case with "Friends and Acquaintances."<sup>1</sup> The author has developed his powers in many directions. His genius has ripened. What were formerly mere hints, have now developed themselves into pleasant pages of reading. Every one will remember how the writer in his former work gave us some glimpses of the country, which were made more beautiful by the dark contrast with the squalid life in London alleys and courts. These glimpses have now expanded into chapters full of pleasant pictures of country scenery and farmhouse life. We have never read anything more pastoral and more truly idyllic than the two sketches called "Travels Behind a Plough," and "Horseshoe Meadow." The writer is no imitator; he nowhere works up his pictures, as is the fashion of the day. There is no word-painting, which is generally another term for daubing. He sets down just what he sees. The scene has evidently impressed him, and he is consequently able to impress the reader. The description flows from his heart, and thus goes to the hearts of others. Let us take the first sketch, "Travels Behind a Plough." The whole chapter is a photograph. The philologist would in a moment, by the internal evidence of such words as "stetches" (ridges between the furrows), "paigles" (cowslips), "haysel" (hay-harvest), and "popple" (any bubbling, rippling noise), set the scene down in the Eastern Counties. Every painter would at a glance recognise the low coast line, the low dull salt Backwater, with its coarse-herbaged marshes, its grassy seabank, fringed with spiry samphire, the solitary tan-sailed barge, the

---

<sup>21</sup> "Famous Women and Heroes." A Poem, in seven parts. By Nicholas Michell. London: William Tegg. 1871.

<sup>1</sup> "Friends and Acquaintances." By the Author of "Episodes in an Obscure Life." London: Strahan & Co. 1871.

rusty-piled, rusty-ringed wharf, and the one public-house, with its enormous sign creaking in the wind. But it is not so much with the scenery as with the personages that we are concerned. The writer begins apologetically for his hero, who is a mere rustic with a taste for scenery. We believe that this type of man is far more common than is generally thought. French writers have often remarked that the peasant in France takes far more interest in the beauties of nature than the farmer, whose mind is engrossed in fattening his stock and in the rise and fall of the markets. We believe that this is the case to some extent in England. At all events, we know by experience that "Sam" is no ideal character. Such a peasant may frequently be found noting the arrival and departure of the birds, observing signs, such as the closing and opening of various flowers, the direction of the clouds and the wind, the habits of various insects, which all for him foretell the coming sunshine or storm; possessing reverence for the church, and a qualified faith in horse-shoes, magpies, and "wise-women." Such a character is drawn for us in "Travels Behind a Plough." This one sketch is worth whole circulating libraries of fashionable novels. Equally well done is the "Horse-shoe Meadow." This time the scene is laid in one of our Midland Counties, beside one of our many Avons—perhaps Shakspeare's own stream. The picture of the farm, with the Avon circling round the Horse-shoe Meadow, almost answers word for word to Hotspur's well-known description of how the Trent "comes cranking in," cutting "a huge half-moon, a monstrous cantle out." The story is full of pathos; and the last scene between the dying father and the unfortunate daughter is thoroughly true to nature. Of the other sketches we can merely say that many of them are excellent. Those which we like least—such as "A Supper in a Caravan"—are modelled after the worst characteristics of the Dickens school. The writer has no necessity to borrow from anybody; he has a clear manly style of his own, to which we trust he will do justice in a work of a more sustained character than the present.

Mr. Meredith has long since won a recognised position in literature. Whatever he writes, and he has written much, is distinctively marked by real genius. He possesses in no ordinary degree insight into character, humour and wit, descriptive power, and lastly real poetical feeling. He has made for himself a unique position. He holds in literature a place by himself. We know no one with whom to compare him for the purposes of criticism. In his latest novel,<sup>2</sup> "The Adventures of Harry Richmond," which has been the delight of so many readers of the *Cornhill Magazine*, this circumstance is more than usually apparent. Criticism in Mr. Meredith's case is always difficult. But in "Harry Richmond" the difficulty is doubled. The work is one by itself. It is, in truth, not a novel, but a romance. Mr. Meredith does with the reader what he pleases—transports him into a world of his own, and dazzles him with creations of his

---

<sup>2</sup> "The Adventures of Harry Richmond." By George Meredith. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1871.

own teeming fancy. Whilst we are reading, we are fascinated and spell-bound. It is not until we have closed the book, and the spell has lost some of its charm, that we feel ourselves to be critically inclined. Criticism, especially of the cold-blooded kind, would, we fear, make short work of Mr. Meredith's pleasant extravagance. For our own part we are more disposed to call attention to the gay fancies and the wealth of poetry which the author has so freely scattered over his pages.

"Half a Dozen Daughters"<sup>3</sup> is, as Dyce Sombre said of the House of Lords, "very dull, but very instruct." The author is a follower of Miss Austen, but he wants both her exquisite humour and dramatic power. His tale is, however, in many respects far above the ordinary circulating-library type. Here and there the conversations are somewhat lively, but the general effect is weak. The tone is excellent.

It is a real pleasure to meet a really well-told story; and it is equally a real pleasure to be able to praise, instead of continually condemning and fault-finding. Mrs. Parr, who is well known as the authoress of "Dorothy Fox," has given us, not one good story but a whole collection of good stories.<sup>4</sup> Each is excellent in its way. We shall take the first two. "How it all Happened" is a tale of two marriages, which happen in the most improbable way, but to which Mrs. Parr, by her happy humour, which wards off all criticism, contrives to give the air of probability. This in itself is a masterpiece of art. The style, and especially the humour, reminds us of Jane Austen's skill. There is the same high tone of a well-bred lady kept up throughout. The humour is of that same subtle sort which lets you, by a kind of by-play, into the whole secret. Nothing can well be simpler than the story. An old colonel leaves behind him two daughters, with only sixty pounds a year, and a small cottage. Upon this income they have to do their duty as Englishwomen—keep up their respectability. So when the wealthy miller of the place proposes to the eldest sister, Pamela, she sorrowfully declines him, on the ground "we have our father's position to maintain." It may be observed, that the only other property this lady possessed was the aristocratic family nose, of which she was very proud. Further to keep up their position, when they went to town to receive their dividends, they always travelled first-class. The younger sister had, on one occasion, to travel up without Pamela. When seated in her glory all alone in a first-class carriage, a middle-aged gentleman brusquely entered, muttering, as she imagined, a most improper oath. The oath turned out, however, to be merely "*dame seule*." What follows is in the very best style of the highest comedy, and cannot possibly be abbreviated without being spoilt. It ends, as it should do, in a proposal. The story then takes up Pamela's love adventures

<sup>3</sup> "Half a Dozen Daughters." By J. Masterman. Author of a "Fatal Error." London: Henry S. King & Co. 1871.

<sup>4</sup> "How it all Happened. And other Stories." By Louisa Parr. Author of "Dorothy Fox." London: Strahan & Co. 1871.

with a Mr. Potter, one of "the Suffolk Potters, not the Lincolnshire Potters, you know;" and everything in this case too ends happily. The next story is of a very different kind. It serves to illustrate Mrs. Parr's versatility. We are taken down to a Devonshire farmhouse, which is described with loving care and accuracy. The farmer and his wife don't speak a cockney jargon, as most novelists imagine Devonshire rustics to speak, but the true Doric, such as may be heard in the "combes" and moors round Denbury or Warleigh. And here too Mrs. Parr shows her skill. She does not write as a professed glossarist illustrating the dialect of the country would do, nor does she overlay the conversation with too many provincialisms, making it a puzzle to all but members of the Philological Society, but simply by the introduction of a word or two lets us know that we really are in the West of England, not far from Dartmoor and the Dart. The descriptions of the scenes really do justice to that loveliest of counties. Nothing can be better in its way than the raspberry-picking under the shade of the big walnut-tree. The story here is the old one—how the course of true love never does run smooth. The conclusion is particularly pathetic. "Talk about weddings," says the old farmer's wife, "there's only a pin to choose between them and funerals;" and the wedding of poor Kitty with the worthless Arthur turns out to be her funeral. The sadness of the tale is, however, relieved by the love of Randall and Esty. We have not space to deal with any of the other stories. We will merely say that they are all equally good, and that Mrs. Parr is as happy in describing foreign characters and foreign scenery as those of her native land. We most heartily recommend her volumes to all those who can appreciate true humour and true pathos.

"Known to None"<sup>5</sup> is a very fair specimen of that false art which infests so many novels. The writer is incapable of producing any effect by legitimate means. She apparently possesses neither humour nor poetry. She therefore has resort to what we may call the tricks of the trade—mystery, sensationalism, and fine language. She loads her brush with colour, and daubs it on as thick as she knows how. She piles up her agony in the approved fashion, and makes her characters talk in a stilted language which is never spoken except on the boards of a fourth-rate theatre. We suppose that there are people who like this sort of thing, and to them we can most cordially recommend the book.

George Eliot has adopted a plan with the publication of "Middlemarch,"<sup>6</sup> which undoubtedly has its advantages for herself, but certainly severely taxes the reader and still more severely the critic. In one sense George Eliot's novels bear publishing piecemeal better than any other writer's. Like all great masters, she makes those pauses and gives us those breaks which are so necessary for repose in the enjoyment of a work of art. Most writers who publish their tales by in-

<sup>5</sup> "Known to None. A Village Romance." London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1871.

<sup>6</sup> "Middlemarch. A Story of Provincial Life." By George Eliot. Vol. I. London: Blackwood and Sons. 1871.

stalments seem to leave the quantity to be published entirely to the printer's option. As long as the tale of monthly sheets is filled, it does not apparently matter to them where the part finishes. George Eliot's art is quite of another style. And yet for this very reason, because her art is so perfect, so organic, it will not bear to be doled out by dribblets. Looking at the present number of "*Middlemarch*" is very like looking at some newly begun picture by a great artist. He explains to you that where you see a few blurred lines there will be some saint's face, and that here, where all is blank, will be the cross which she will bear, and that there, it may be on the ground, will lie the shattered crown of glory which she should have worn. So with "*Middlemarch*." George Eliot tells us in the proem what she intends to do. The headings of the chapters point like finger-posts showing us the road we are to travel. But this at present is all. Our remarks, therefore, will be of the very briefest, as it is quite impossible for any one to judge of the real scope and meaning of the tale. He can only pronounce upon the workmanship of what is before him. This, we need not say, is perfect. George Eliot here shows that supreme mastery of language which has by common consent been allowed her. Her characters, little as we see of them at present, are all distinctly marked by a few bold touches which leave them for ever impressed on our memories. The old humour and glittering wit which has so often delighted us, shine forth again. Once more we meet too those matchless descriptions of English scenery which only George Eliot can paint. That the book will be a great book there cannot be a doubt—one more noble addition to our English literature. But until we can judge of it as a whole we prefer to reserve our criticism.

It is a very long step from George Eliot to Mr. Lockhart.<sup>7</sup> If we may venture on a comparison, we experience the same sort of feeling which we have felt in Catholic countries on a fête day, of coming out of some noble cathedral, with its painted windows and long aisles, down which the organ is pealing, and stepping out into the cathedral yard, where the jugglers and the mountebanks and athletes are performing their tricks. We do not for one moment quarrel with Mr. Lockhart. He only does what every novelist does, except perhaps one in ten thousand—deal with the body and its amusements instead of with the mind. But he is also, what not one in the ten thousand is, thoroughly amusing. His is precisely the book for those who want to be amused, and not to be perplexed with any moral questions or doubts. His narrative is rapid, his characters natural, his conversations humorous, and he thoroughly knows the ground which he goes over. Now what can subscribers to *Mudie's* desire more? One especial recommendation we can give to the story—that though it deals with military men and sporting men, there is nothing whatever of the "*Guy Livingstone*" tone about it. It is thoroughly healthy. The

---

<sup>7</sup> "*Fair to See. A Novel.*" By Laurence W. M. Lockhart, Author of "*Doubles and Quits.*" London: Blackwood and Sons. 1871.

scenes abroad remind us of some of the best of Lever's tales. The plot, too, is good, and the interest is well kept up. Of the characters, Mrs. M'Killop of Tolmie-Donnochie, as she will inform everybody, struck us on her first introduction as a caricature. But a vulgar Scotch-woman is the vulgarst thing in creation, not even excepting Irish and American. She is however very amusing with her friends, who rejoice in double-barrelled names, as Thackeray used to say—the Fortnum-Redmaynes, the Morissy-Moloneys, and the rest. Of the minor characters we must give a word of praise to the "Kicker," and also to the self-restraint which the author has imposed upon himself in not carrying his fun too far. But it is upon Eila that the author has bestowed his greatest care. She is of the girl-of-the-period type. She does not, as some of her sisterhood do, regularly stalk a man down, but takes snap-shots at all eldest sons and big rent-rolls. Her scheming and lying are almost worthy of our beloved Betsy Sharpe. Her letters, too, are admirable. The touch about the gloves in one of them must, we fancy, be copied from nature. We only regret that the author at last indulged in the vice of mercy, and let her down so easy. She deserved no quarter. Of the rest we must content ourselves by saying that Pigott and Cameron are excellent specimens of their type. The conversation is especially happy. The way in which Duncannon is taken down at pp. 183, 184, in the first volume, is a good specimen of what the author can do in this line. Nor does he forget his skill when "his Excellency" is introduced to Mrs. M'Killop. As to the politics in the book, those who do not like them can skip them. It appears to us that the author has simply extended Mill's well-known saying that the vice of the poorer classes in England is lying, by the addition of the proverb—"Show me a liar, and I will show you a thief." In conclusion, we will only repeat our previous recommendation, that the book is one of the very best of its kind, thoroughly amusing and thoroughly healthy.

Miss Saunders<sup>8</sup> is, we believe, comparatively speaking quite a new writer. At all events this is the first work which we have ever read of hers. If she has not woke up one morning lately, and found herself famous, she deserves to have done so. This collection of stories will put her in the front rank of novelists. We must be taken literally. She has no affinity whatever with writers of such a stamp as Mrs. Wood, Mr. Yates, "Holme Lee," and others, who are, we believe, the favourites of the hour with the public at Mudie's. She shows qualities of which we have never caught a glimpse in their works. She possesses power—not the spasmodic sort of counterfeit which every writer can do, but power proceeding from earnestness and genuine inspiration. And this quality of power is likely to prove repulsive to many readers who are accustomed to the sentimentalities which are so fashionable. Her characters too are the result of this power. They are not a bundle of traits, kept within certain bounds, and who by acting always

<sup>8</sup> "The Haunted Crust." By Katherine Saunders. Author of "The High Mills," &c. London: Strahan & Co. 1871.

uniformly are supposed to have some semblance to a human being. They act as human beings do act—from the impulse within them, which varies in direction and intensity. But this is not the only rare gift which Miss Saunders possesses. She possesses genuine sweetness and pathos. She writes with a feeling of enthusiasm and poetry about not only the sea, and the sea-coast, and sea-folk, with whom she evidently has a most intimate acquaintance, but of the broad rich meadows of our Eastern and Midland Counties, of their blossoming orchards, and of the old ferries upon the slow winding rivers. She draws direct from nature. Her similes are thoroughly poetical. Take, for instance, in the first tale, “*The Haunted Crust*,” the following description of Mercy: “Her face was small; not round, nor dimpled, yet not thin-looking, but beautifully soft, and of the same warm whiteness all over; just, perhaps, a little warmer in the middle of the cheeks, as you see a bunch of apple-blossom gets pinker towards the heart” (vol. i. p. 8). The simile is exquisitely dainty, and might have been written by one of our Elizabethan poets. Take again, too, the description which immediately follows of the same face—“A kind of face with full and sorrowful blue eyes, with a blue shadow lying under them, and eyelids heavy with black lashes that seemed always wanting to go to sleep on her cheek; a mouth like two cherries pressing together” (vol. i. pp. 8, 9). This, too, is thoroughly Shakspearian. The “blue shadow” reminds us of those lovely lines in “*Lucrece* :”—

“And round about her tear-distained eye  
Blue circles streamed;”

and no one, we suppose, will read “a mouth like two cherries pressing together” without thinking of Demetrius’s speech to Helena: “Thy lips, those kissing cherries,” and the “twinning cherries” in the “*Two Noble Kinsmen*.” But it is not in these detached bits that the author’s real strength can be seen. She is an artist. Each story centres round a point. In one story it is love, in another remorse, in another envy. In each case there is a strong central motive which is never lost sight of. It is, however, impossible that a writer who possesses so many charms should not also have some great faults. The rich soil that produces most flowers also produces most weeds. Miss Saunders is at times betrayed by her great power into scenes which leave upon the reader’s mind an impression of pain. Perhaps in a longer story this would not be case; they would then naturally fall into their proper subordinate positions. A short story, which is read in a quarter of an hour, will not bear so violent a strain. There is, too, another point to which we must call attention, and which, as a matter of art, we must regard as a great fault. Miss Saunders is too fond of theatrical effects. Once in a way they are permissible; but when they are so often repeated they lose all their force. We shall look forward to Miss Saunders’ next work with real interest. We have not since the appearance of “*Scenes in Clerical Life*,” seen any collection of tales which give so much indication of real genius and promise of future success as “*The Haunted Crust*.”



Mr. Call's new volume of *Poems*<sup>9</sup> suggests how far will the poetry of the future be influenced and modified by modern thought. We have just now all kinds of schools of poetry; but the singers who represent the growing opinions of the day are few. When we have named Clough, and Palgrave, and Mr. Call, we have named all. Clough's poetry is so vacillating and often so vague, that though it is sure to have admirers for its beauty, we doubt if it will ever really affect the minds of the rising generation. Mr. Palgrave has written so little, that it is difficult to make any prediction concerning his future. What he has, however, written is decidedly higher, and has, so to speak, a firmer grip, and is more stamped with the revolutionary thoughts of our time, than even Clough's. Mr. Call's volume is now before us; and the first thing which would, we suppose, strike most readers is its note of modern Paganism; not the Paganism of Mr. Morris, but of Clough—that note which is at times so intensely melancholy, yearning not for the world to come—not the individual existence beyond the grave, which has been the world's stay and comfort for so many generations—but for that future when, if ever, shall be the true Golden Age. And this note, as it seems to us, runs through all his poems: it lends a beauty even to his lightest pieces; it throws a new spell upon life, and endows its very shortness with a fresh pathos. Hence, too, it may be that Mr. Call so loves to linger upon the joys of childhood. He has touched with many notes of joy that time when "life goes a-Maying with Nature, Hope, and Poesy." He has touched, too, with many notes of sadness, that time "when I was young, ah! woful when"—the sadness which modern philosophy tends more and more to bring out. Mr. Call's poetry is, in short, interwoven with his views. You must read between the lines. Here is a little piece in which the careless reader would simply feel the beauty of expression and the music of the rhythm, and miss altogether the moral:—

"THE MILL STREAM.

"A child looks into the mill-stream,  
Where the fish glide in and out,  
The dace with the coat of silver,  
And the crimson-spotted trout.

"He plays with the diamond waters,  
He talks to the droning bees,  
He sings, and the birds sing with him,  
He runs as to catch the breeze.

"A perfume from wood and meadow  
Is wandering round the boy;  
He is twining a garland of lilies,  
And joyous he thinks not of joy.

---

<sup>9</sup> "Golden Histories." By W. M. W. Call. Author of "*Reverberations*." London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1871.

“ He prays in the eve and morning,  
For the Heaven seems always near,  
And he thinks that each childish murmur  
Is a charm that the angels hear.

“ O life ! O ! beautiful picture !  
O light, and perfume, and love !  
O the grace of the heart that is tender !  
O the dream that can lift us above !

“ O life ! no longer a problem,  
But a something to see and enjoy,  
A brightness on stream and meadow,  
A breeze round a dancing boy.

“ Back, back to the fair blue morning  
Of wild Hope and of Fancy wild,  
Let me watch the fish in the mill-stream  
With the eyes and the heart of a child.”

Mr. Call is no idle singer. He has been a student, but far above all study he prizes the nobleness of a high and active life. As has been well said, it is the highest office of poetry to set to verse the discoveries of thought. Mr. Call does more. He paints for us his ideal of life—life made beautiful by sympathy with the sufferings of others, life rendered noble by labour and self-sacrifice. Such we take it to be the meaning of “Golden Histories.” Our space will not possibly allow us to deal with more than one of them. We shall choose “Manoli.” The tale is founded upon a Moldo-Wallachian legend. There was once a belief current in Wallachia that to make the foundations of either church or tower stand, some human victim must be immured alive beneath them. Master Manoli was the architect of the monastery of Curte d’Argish, which the Hospodar Neagu Bessaraba was building. In vain the masons tried to rear the walls, but floods and storms destroyed them. The Hospodar determined that one of the masons should be sacrificed. But the men made a compact amongst themselves, that that wife should be the victim who should next morning first bring her husband his meal. Each one, with the exception of Manoli, forbad their wives to come. Utza alone comes, and the legend describes how the wall is built up, closing gradually round her, hushing her sobs and cries, and from that day forth never shook. We shall not dwell upon the pathos with which Mr. Call tells the story, and his restrained severity of language which gives to it a feeling of awe. We wish to point out the way in which he spiritualizes the tale. Here are the concluding lines :—

“ But they went building on, and stone on stone  
Was reared, and the great fabric touched the sky,  
As days clasped hands with days. Supreme it stood,  
Majestic, massive, silent, beautiful !  
And men came there, and wondered while they gazed,  
And thronged around the masters, as they told  
Of the true, noble life that passed away,

To round their labour to full-sphered success :—  
 For always the great conquest of the world  
 Is won with blood. 'Twas so in elder years,  
 The splendid yesterdays our fathers knew :  
 'Tis so in these pale faded years of ours ;  
 And when these busy hands and brains are still,  
 And mightier builders work with lordlier aims,  
 The same old doom will reign, and men will die,  
 To crown their age with beauty, and to bring  
 Imperial days while they go building on."

Mr. Call's poetry is intimately associated with his philosophy. It is, in short, dominated by great ideas. We have not picked out any of those happy descriptions of Nature of which his pages are full,—pictures of the fields and woods and streams ; we have not dwelt upon his perfect expression of language, his love of beauty, his feeling for form and colour, his intense delight in the presence of the sea and mountains and sky, because we wish especially to call attention to that still higher love for humanity, that firm belief in science, and that unshaken hope in Progress, which so shines forth in his poems. To illustrate our meaning let us add one more quotation. It is the conclusion of "A Child's Romance," and gives us an ideal picture of what the world may some day be :—

"O golden years, advance, advance !  
 O years of regal work and thought !  
 O doubting hearts ! the child's romance  
 Shall into splendid fact be wrought ;  
 By laughing years, in choral dance,  
 The world's great summer shall be brought,  
 And cradled hours shall wake and sing  
 An autumn rich in fruits, as once in buds the spring.

"A fairer knighthood shall be ours,  
 Than ever Norman baron knew,  
 With sweeter women in our bowers,  
 For tender, nobler men to woo ;  
 Truth from a thousand starry towers  
 Her flaming torch shall lift anew,  
 And Art, that old, diviner truth,  
 Shall bring again the age of man's resplendent youth.

"Then Science, reconcil'd with Song,  
 Shall throb with life's melodious beat,  
 Then Song, thro' Science wise and strong,  
 Shall her unpassion'd tale repeat ;  
 Then Right shall reign, discrowning Wrong,  
 Then old Compliance shall be sweet,  
 Then star to kindred star shall call,  
 And soul to soul shall answer "Love is Lord of all."

The great value of Mr. Call's poetry, to us at least, lies in the views which he takes of the future of the human race. He is thoroughly penetrated with the modern spirit. He is the poet of Progress. He

brings with him freshness and force. His tone is bracing and invigorating. And minds jaded and wearied with the present perplexing confusion of things, of the mastery of evil over good, of hypocrisy sitting in high places, and lying impudence triumphing, may find not only soothing rest and comfort in his pages, but fresh strength and power with which to fight the battle of life.

Mr. Michell has sent us no less than three closely printed volumes of poetry. There was an actor once who begged a manager to accept his play on the ground that it was exactly the same length as *Hamlet*. According to our computation Mr. Michell has written somewhere about as much as all Shakspeare's plays put together. His resemblance, however, to Shakspeare is, like the actor's, only in quantity. His first volume is entitled "Sibyl of Cornwall,"<sup>10</sup> It contains a number of pieces, such as "The Land's End," "St. Michael's Mount," "The Classic Rhone," &c. After carefully reading them through we think that we comprehend the meaning of Goethe's lines—

"Denn besonders die Poeten,  
Die verderben die Natur."

Mr. Michell's next volume is, for some incomprehensible reason, entitled "Pleasure."<sup>11</sup> Mr. Michell in his preface asks "What is pleasure?" We can only answer him negatively—certainly not in reading his poems. He maunders on from the Lakes of Killarney to the Falls of Niagara, and from the Sabine Hills to the Andes. His reflections about music, sculpture, painting, are the merest commonplace hitched into rhyme. We must, however, take exception to a couplet upon music—

"Music exists for all; its silvery spring  
Flows for the beggar as the king."—p. 71.

Considering the price of a stall at the Opera, we cannot say with Mr. Michell, that "music exists for all." The Opera House, as Horne Tooke said about the London Tavern, is open for anybody who can afford to pay. Viewed, however, from this point, Mr. Michell's, epithet "silvery," is most correct. He has, however, been anticipated by Shakspeare. "Then music with her silver sound," sings Peter, in "Romeo and Juliet." "Why silver sound? why music with her silver sound?" And the musician answers, "I say silver sound, because musicians sound for silver." And this seems to give some sense to Mr. Michell's verse.

In Mr. Michell's next volume, the "Immortals,"<sup>12</sup> the prose is more wonderful than even the verse. Here he is good enough to in-

<sup>10</sup> "Sibyl of Cornwall; The Land's End; St. Michael's Mount, and other Poems." By Nicholas Michell. London: William Tegg. 1871.

<sup>11</sup> "Pleasure." A Poem in Seven Parts. By Nicholas Michell. London: William Tegg. 1871.

<sup>12</sup> "The Immortals, or Glimpses of Paradise." By Nicholas Michell. London: William Tegg. 1871.

form us, "that spiritual intelligences," or, as he also calls them, "beatified spirits," or "angelic existences," are allowed to visit the earth and to investigate the works in it (p. 203). We can make some slight sense out of Mr. Michell's verse, but his prose is quite beyond us.

The new edition of Canon Kingsley's poems<sup>13</sup> is very welcome. In our opinion it is a great mistake that he has not devoted himself more to the cultivation of poetry than to science, theology, or history, for none of which he possesses the slightest aptitude. As a writer of ballad and descriptive poetry he might have won a rank second to none in our generation. Whether he would have succeeded in higher works may, perhaps, be doubtful. But as there are so few, one or two men in a century, who can achieve success of any kind in poetry, our regret is doubled when we see him wasting his powers in uncongenial labours. Such pieces as "A Farewell," "Airly Beacon," "A Lament," and many others, are real additions to our literature. They possess all the best characteristics of song and ballad—directness, simplicity, music, and pathos. It is an especial pleasure to be able to cordially praise this volume, as we generally find ourselves utterly differing from Canon Kingsley upon nearly every subject under the sun.

Mr. Kenward<sup>14</sup> is a bold man. He has certainly rushed in where the greatest poets have feared to tread. No doubt we shall some day have the poetical novel instead of the three volumes of prose. Even with the greatest novelists an immense deal of our time is taken up with mere verbiage. Prose is a very cumbersome instrument compared to poetry. What the poet paints by two or three bold strokes requires at least two or three chapters of explanation from the ordinary novelist. Still Mr. Kenward's attempt is better than we could have expected. He writes with great ease and fluency, almost at times with eloquence. He shows a knowledge of a great many subjects, which help to give a certain solidity to his writing. But we are afraid that we can only at present regard "Oriel" as an experiment, pointing out the direction in which the modern novel is travelling.

Colonel Colomb's "Donnington Castle"<sup>15</sup> consists of exactly 199 pages of doggerel. To show that we use the only term applicable to such rubbish we give a quotation:—

"September the 20th, 'forty-three,  
Was fought the first battle of Newbury,  
Where gallant Caernarvon and Sunderland brave  
With the noble Falkland did find a grave:  
When the king a mourning scarf had put on,

<sup>13</sup> "Poems: including the Saint's Tragedy, Andromeda, Songs, Ballads." By Charles Kingsley. Collected Edition. London: Macmillan and Co. 1871.

<sup>14</sup> "Oriel. A Study in Eighteen Hundred and Seventy." With Two other Poems. By James Kenward, F.S.A. London: Chapman and Hall. 1871.

<sup>15</sup> "Donnington Castle." A Royalist Story. In *Fourteen Staves*. With Notes. By Colonel Colomb. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1871.

Boys into Packer's old house is gone,  
Which though fortress they call,  
Was but house or hall."—p. 131.

Colonel Colomb has heard of Shakspeare and Milton, for he mentions them in his introduction. The puzzle, however, is what good does the study of them do such people as Colonel Colomb. Some of our poets, however, never seem to have heard of either Milton or Shakspeare. Here is Mrs. Crossland,<sup>16</sup> who could surely have never heard of Tennyson, or else she could not have perpetrated such a line as "Autumn, with finger chill, now newly maps the grove," after the Laureate's "Autumn here and there, laying a fiery finger on the leaves." And yet Mrs. Crossland's poetry is not utterly bad. She evidently has a thorough love for Nature. But so have thousands of people. They are, however, sensible enough to perceive how far short their poems come of the standard by which they must be judged, and wisely abstain from publication. Mrs. Crossland's poems will, however, be welcomed by a large number of private friends.

The last translation of "*Suave, mari magno turbantibus æquora ventis*" may be found in Mr. Harvey's poems:—<sup>17</sup>

"Tear the tides of the Atlantic,—  
Tcase the temper of the seas,—  
Till they lash their sides in fury,  
While I laugh it at my ease"—p. 92.

We would propose, instead of "in fury" in the third line, "so frantic." It might not be so Lucretian, but it would give a rhyme to Atlantic.

Of the remainder of the volumes of poetry before us, one or two deserve a word of recommendation for their culture and high tone of thought. Whether they will ever make their mark in the world is more than doubtful. The number of cultivated men who have travelled and seen the world, who, perhaps, besides having a talent for poetry, are amateur painters, or musicians, or naturalists, is every day increasing. In this class of books we may put Mr. Pember's "*Tristissimæ Vitæ*."<sup>18</sup> On every page of it shines cultivation and refinement. What books of this sort want is power. It is invidious to mention names, but we could pick out several poets of the present day who have won a reputation with the public, but who do not possess a tenth part of Mr. Pember's delicacy and grace, whilst they are far beneath him in width of view. Another of these books is "*Ttsoé and other Poems*."<sup>19</sup> The authors must look for their reward neither in applause nor in pay, but in those delights which a life of culture and study can alone bring. Let them remember that the Greek dramatists never received a farthing for their plays.

<sup>16</sup> "The Diamond Wedding, and other Poems." By Mrs. Newton Crossland. London: Houlston and Sons. 1871.

<sup>17</sup> "Poems." By Robert Cadzow Harvey. William P. Nimmo, Edinburgh. 1871.

<sup>18</sup> "*Tristissimæ Vitæ*." A Triptych. By E. H. Pember. London: Thomas Bosworth. 1871.

<sup>19</sup> "*Ttsoé, and other Poems*." London: Basil Montague Pickering. 1871.

Mr. Ballantyne's "Lilias Lee"<sup>20</sup> appeals more to Scotch than English readers. Some of the songs in this volume are really fine, and worthy of the land of Burns. We have no doubt that they will become extremely popular north of the Tweed.

And here let us call attention to "Psalms of Life,"<sup>21</sup> by Miss Doudney, with a preface by the Rev. R. H. Baynes, the well-known Editor of the "Churchman's Shilling Magazine," a serial which really does provide good sound reading. The poems are much above the average, and the little book is brought out in a most tasteful manner, which reflects great credit upon the publishers.

Our "Noble Selves" should have been the title of "The Secret of Long Life."<sup>22</sup> It is in reality the autobiography of a literary man. And as we know the enormous interest which the public takes in a literary man, we make no apology for laying before them the most intimate secrets of his life, as disclosed in the present volume. The clever creature, it appears, never goes to bed till three o'clock in the morning. He sits up all night writing slashing leaders (p. 66). From time to time between the glowing periods he refreshes his wearied brain with a bottle of hock (p. 61), no doubt a present sent to him from Bismarck or Moltke. The vast sums of money which he makes we dare not estimate. This benefactor to his species only throws out vague and mysterious hints on the subject (p. 68). They must, however, be enormous, for he never touches a breakfast, but always eats a banquet. Here is the Græculus esuriens over again. *Omnia novit*. The literary man can teach us everything:—orators to speak, poets to make poetry, and generals to march (p. 110). One or two things, however, strike us as singular,—that a gentleman who talks so glibly about theology should fancy that Mr. Froude is a Calvinist (p. 10); that one who does not hesitate to sneer at Darwin and Huxley should be unable to write correctly the only scientific term which occurs in his book, and that one who, according to his own account, drinks the rarest Rhine wines, should be under the impression that the vintage on the Rhine takes place in August, and that the grapes are pressed by the feet of naked-legged German girls (p. 79). As this idea is so evidently borrowed from those coloured prints formerly used for albums, a dim suspicion comes over us that all those fine names of wines which the author so freely drinks may after all only be taken from some wine merchant's circular. Either the author has never drunk them, or else drunk too much of them.

Owing to the pressure on our space by the quantity of books at the beginning of the year, we must deal briefly with the remainder. The Rev. James Stormonth's English Dictionary<sup>23</sup> is admirable. The

<sup>20</sup> "Lilias Lee, and other Poems." By James Ballantyne. London: William Blackwood and Sons. 1871.

<sup>21</sup> "Psalms of Life." By Sarah Doudney. London: Houlston and Sons. 1871.

<sup>22</sup> "The Secret of Long Life." London: Henry S. King and Co. 1871.

<sup>23</sup> "Etymological and Pronouncing Dictionary of the English Language." For use in Schools and Colleges. By the Rev. James Stormonth. The Pronunciation Revised by the Rev. P. H. Phelps. London: Blackwood and Sons. 1871.

etymological part especially is good and sound. We have turned to "calamity," "forest," "poltroon," and a number of other crucial words, and find them all derived according to the newest lights. There is nothing about "calamus," and "foris," and "pollice truncus," such as we used to find in the etymological dictionaries of the old type. The work deserves a place in every English school, whether boys' or girls'.

"Pen Photographs,"<sup>24</sup> is a well-intentioned but foolish book. The authoress possesses not the slightest critical power or insight. It is full of vapid unmeaning praise. Judicious criticism is more required in Dickens's case than in that of any other recent writer. But here we cannot perceive even the faintest effort made to help the reader to appreciate either his great excellences, or to understand the very limited circle in which his ideas moved.

The Literary articles in the *Times* have never been very celebrated. The two volumes of essays by the late Mr. Samuel Phillips,<sup>25</sup> which have been collected from the columns of that journal, will not help its reputation. As a rule we see far higher criticisms in our contemporaries the *Pall Mall Gazette* and the *Saturday Review*. Still these volumes will supply much better reading than the railway bookstall novels against which they are intended to compete.

Mr. Hope,<sup>26</sup> as we have said on a previous occasion, always writes sensibly about schools, schoolboys, and masters. In the present volume we notice, what we have not done before, a strong element of humour. Some of the schoolboy essays and letters put us in mind of Thackeray's performances in the same line.

Amongst school-books we must specially recommend the Rev. R. H. Quick's "Companion to Schiller's Wilhelm Tell."<sup>27</sup> We thoroughly agree with what the editor says about big dictionaries for beginners. His own plan is admirable. A boy with any degree of intelligence is sure to learn by the aid of such an excellent vocabulary. Mr. Sidgwick's name is a sufficient guarantee for the excellence of any Greek plays which he edits.<sup>28</sup> Among other books, which we can now merely acknowledge, is a Sophocles in the series of "Ancient Classics for

<sup>24</sup> "Pen Photographs of Charles Dickens's Readings." Taken from Life. By Kate Field, an American. London : Trubner and Co. 1871.

<sup>25</sup> "Essays from 'The Times.' Being a Selection from the Literary Papers which have appeared in that Journal." In two Volumes. London : John Murray. 1871.

<sup>26</sup> "Master John Bull." A Holiday Book for Parents and Schoolmasters. By Ascott R. Hope. Edinburgh : W. P. Nimmo. 1872.

<sup>27</sup> "Companion to Schiller's Wilhelm Tell." Being a Complete Vocabulary with Notes, and an Historical Introduction. By Hermann Müller-Strübing. Edited by the Rev. R. H. Quick, M.A. London : David Nutt. 1871.

<sup>28</sup> I. "Scenes from Aristophanes (Rugby Edition). By A. Sidgwick. The Frogs. II. Scenes from Euripides. Rugby Edition. By A. Sidgwick. The Cyclops. III. Scenes from Euripides. Rugby Edition. By A. Sidgwick. Iphigenia in Tauris." London : Rivingtons. 1871.



English Readers,"<sup>29</sup> and a most convenient edition of our own great classic's "Vanity Fair."<sup>30</sup>

German poetry<sup>31</sup> not unnaturally continues to sing the recent triumphs of the Fatherland. But we think it is high time to give over celebrating "Die Schlacht bei Weissenburg" and the "Uebergabe von Sedan," and to turn to the happier results of the great war. Herr Millatzen's<sup>32</sup> little volume of poems is far above the average.

<sup>29</sup> "Sophocles." By Clifton W. Collins, M.A. (Ancient Classics for English Readers.) London: Blackwood and Sons. 1871.

<sup>30</sup> "Vanity Fair." A Novel without a Hero. By William Makepeace Thackeray. With a Portrait. London: Smith, Elder and Co. 1871.

<sup>31</sup> "Historische, Volks- und Volksthümliche Lieder des Krieges von 1870-1871. Berlin: Franz Lipperheide. 1871.

<sup>32</sup> "Gedichte." Von P. Millatzen. Bremen: Karl Tannen. 1872.

THE  
WESTMINSTER  
AND  
FOREIGN QUARTERLY  
REVIEW.

~~~~~  
APRIL 1, 1872.  
~~~~~

ART. I.—TRIAL BY JUDGE, AND TRIAL BY JURY.

ON both sides of St. George's Channel, the courts of law have lately presented scenes which, for the general interest they have excited, have been no unworthy successors of the contests fought on a wider field between Prussia and France, or between M. Thiers and the Commune. In London, the hard-fought Tichborne trial has introduced the public into a labyrinth of contradictions out of which no possible way could be found but through such improbabilities that the most daring of novelists would hesitate before plunging into them. For the student of human nature it has provided a most curious enigma; but on the jurors, to whom it was not a matter of option but of necessity to wade through masses of examination and cross-examination, it has imposed a wearisome task; their daily fee, though it contributed to swell the formidable expenses of the cause, being a poor satisfaction for such a forcible impressment. If, at least, we may judge from the impracticability of completing the due tale of jurors, their position would certainly appear to have been thought not very enviable, and to many persons might probably have been ruinous. For a long time the litigants had to contemplate the possibility, and that no very remote one, that after months of waiting, after enormous cost and incalculable labour, the jury might find themselves unable to agree, and might be dismissed without a verdict—the demands of justice unsatisfied, no official decision pronounced on the position of those whose characters were at stake, and the sole legal remedy (!) a repetition of the whole proceedings. In Dublin, the jury system, in the trial of Kelly for the murder of

[Vol. XCVII. No. CXCH.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. XLI. No. II. U

Talbot, appeared in a highly unfavourable light; resulting in an acquittal in the face of evidence, on the charge of an act which the Nationalist press, and other known partisans of the prisoner, so far from indignantly denying, claimed for him as a deed of patriotism and righteous vengeance. The sentiment that killing was no murder in the case of a police spy was as influential with the Irish jury, as a like sentiment in the case of a Prussian soldier was influential in dictating one of the most shameful decisions of a French tribunal. Many have been prompted in consequence to raise the inquiry whether jury trial is any benefit to the people of Ireland. But the question may be carried far deeper; it is time we should revise at home as well as abroad, our popular panegyrics on the Palladium of British liberty. Priding ourselves, and with good reason, on our administration of justice as one of the truest glories of our country, we overlook the numerous and grave defects inherent in one branch of its procedure. To many an Englishman, depriving a man of trial by jury seems next thing to introducing Jedwood justice—execution to-day, and trial to-morrow. That the jury system is far from comprising the whole—if it comprises any part—of the merits of modern English law is apparent from the plain fact that it dates back through centuries, in which our courts have presented such a spectacle of pettifogging technicality and judicial murder as had never been witnessed under more despotic governments; when a mistake in a special plea sent men to the gallows untried, and rascals charged with bigamy escaped, through having not two wives but three. If we ever inquire what other system would be possible, the alternative that usually suggests itself is the judicial bench, such as it existed in the days when judicial ability was sold to the wealthiest suitor or prostituted to court favour. That the jury system has lived so long, and has set off its claims to respect by a borrowed descent from the great Saxon lawgiver—like a wealthy family which the *Heralds College* discovers to have come over with the Conqueror—affords no very strong presumption of its suitability to modern requirements. Its popular character, endearing it to the democratic sentiment which has steadily grown in strength throughout our history—the feelings of self-importance that it arouses in “the ordinary middle-class Philistine,” whom it calls for a time from his daily routine of counter or farm to share with the Bench in the important work of judicial decision, and to whom counsel learned in the law address their eloquent appeals in professed reliance on his dispassionate sense and sagacious instincts—these were sure to secure it a sanctuary where modern innovation would be slow to penetrate. But setting aside all such irrelevant considerations, we would

examine the rival merits of the jury and the judge on those rational principles, where alone the wisest advocates of either would wish to take their stand.

Before the subject is touched upon in its more practical aspects, a few words may be devoted to the principle involved in trial by peers or equals—the famous *legale iudicium parium suorum*\* without which, if the *lex terræ* did not intervene, and the provisions of Magna Charta remain unaltered, no free-man could be imprisoned, outlawed, exiled, or disseised. The principle that a tribunal ought to be composed of the prisoner's equals strikes us as being (at least in modern times) *primâ facie* unreasonable. If the sole object of administering justice were to provide every means of escape for a prisoner accused of even the gravest offences, we could see a direct purpose in the provision which substantially enacts that his judges shall be of the class most likely to sympathize with him, and look with a lenient eye on his guilt. It is palpably framed as a safeguard to the accused in a state of society where class-feeling is rampant, and mutual hostilities have engendered in every man that has power over the security or life of his fellow in a different grade, the sentiment of the wolf in the fable—“I know that the whole breed of you hate me, and therefore I am determined to have my revenge.” And certainly, if passion and prejudice are to take up their abode at what should be the securest shrine of refuge from their influence, for the most hated aristocrat, or the most despised plebeian, better at least that it should be prejudice in favour of the accused, and that if the scales of justice hang uneven, she should not throw in the sword to aggravate the inequality. We may have reason to be thankful for services rendered in times past by the enactment, if honest and upright men have at times found in it a protection against the sullen hostility or the frenzied rage of other classes. Where, however, the judge is superior to considerations of rank, such a provision is evidently purposeless; and yet the very supposition on which it is based, of a reluctance in one class to recognise the just rights of another, shows how little justice was to be expected *against* a criminal from judges of his own grade. Let it be imagined that a Saxon lord or Norman baron, desiring the ruin of a humble neighbour, and condescending for the moment to avail himself of the institutions of the land as the instruments of his malice, charges him with a robbery. So reckless, it is supposed, is the disregard shown by one rank of the claims of another, that the culprit, if

\* “The English Cyclopædia,” (art. Jury) and others treat the opinion that these words refer to trial by jury as a “popular and remarkable error.” That view, however, is maintained both by Hallam and Sir E. Creasy.

pursued to a lordly tribunal, would be certain of condemnation, and therefore to offer him a chance of escape, his fate is placed in the hands of his own associates. But again. A second noble, acting on a bolder plan, murders his neighbour outright; and the tribunal which was too much blinded by party feeling to be entrusted with the trial of a plebeian thief, is *ex hypothesi* the fit and proper court in which to judge the patrician assassin!

Such a system, like the benefit of clergy, and other incidents of English law calculated to allow the accused an undue opportunity of escape, would not be without reason in a hasty and barbarous age, unscrupulous of bloodshed. On this ground Michelet defends the claim advanced by the ecclesiastics during the days of Henry and Becket, that they should be responsible to none but ecclesiastical tribunals.

"These rights," he remarks,\* "undoubtedly gave room for great abuses; many crimes were committed with impunity by priests; but when we think of the terrible barbarity, the execrable rapacity of the lay tribunals in the twelfth century, we are forced to own that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction was then an anchor of safety. It might spare the guilty; but how often it saved the innocent."

The demand, as Mill justly remarks, was for nothing more than trial by their peers. Yet we question whether there are now any, at least in this country, who would not strenuously resist the proposal to establish a sacerdotal court to take cognizance not merely of ecclesiastical offences, but of violations of the secular law committed by clerical offenders. We see enough as it is of the effect which a sort of *esprit de corps*, especially (though by no means exclusively) in those less instructed in their social duties, is capable of producing, in perverting the testimony of witnesses, and rendering the judgments of squires a byword throughout the land. A policeman will confirm through thick and thin the story of a brother in the force, and the same very largely holds good of cabmen, railway officials, and many others. The justice before whom Parson Adams was charged in Fielding's novel, and who "hoped he knew his duty, he had never condemned a gentleman in his life," would have an ample number of imitators if the principle of trial by peers were carried out to any logical consequences.

The sanguinary character of the English law long survived the dark ages in which it arose. Our jurisprudence, while in its cruel rigour it confounded under the same category and avenged with the same awful penalty a theft of five shillings and a cold-blooded assassination, at the same time inconsistently pronounced its own just condemnation in often opening a door for the pre-

---

\* "Histoire de France," ii 343.

servation of the accused, whether innocent or guilty. Thus the practice of urging a prisoner to retract a deliberate plea of Guilty, and of going through the formal examination into an offence of which no reasonable doubt could be entertained by the most sympathetic friend of the accused, has been satirically commented upon as intimating a desire that the hunt should not be spoiled for want of the game having a fair start. In a similar spirit one might suppose that the same feeling of humanity (if Mr. Freeman would allow so questionable an application of the word) that prompts some sportsmen to release the game when they have brought it down, led our ancestors to devise cunning means for the ultimate escape of the prisoner who had afforded an interesting and profitable employment to the men of law. So long as trial by equals afforded an escape from intolerable severity in the law, it was, if an illogical, a valuable system. At the present day it seems somewhat difficult to suppose that any man can calmly attach much value to the thought of his liability to trial before none but his equals. Who are his equals? A chimney-sweep, a butcher, a surgeon, the younger son of a peer, a member of the House of Commons—in the theory of the law these are all the equals of one another. And are we to believe that, among all these classes, a mysterious sympathy pervading and confined to commoners will insure the distribution of a degree of justice not to be expected from a Lord Brougham or a Lord Mansfield? Is a man in all cases the equal and the only equal of a woman—a woman never the equal of a man? In times of agitated feeling, or in districts where Churchmen and Dissenters, Protestants and Romanists, regard each other with an intensity of bitterness more than sufficient to satisfy stout old Dr. Johnson's love of "a good hater,"—is each of these the man best fitted to form a dispassionate judgment on an accusation brought against his rival? We have, of course, no thought of deploring this *Isonomia*—this equality of all commoners before the law; but it surely cuts the ground from under the feet of those who allow the trial by peers to dazzle their imaginations with pictures of a sympathetic tribunal ready to act the part of counsel for the defendant—a notion unlike undesirable and impossible of attainment.

Our chief business, however, is with the comparative merits of trial by jury and trial by judge—of a fixed tribunal composed of one or a few lawyers, as against a larger tribunal of "laymen" taken for the occasion from the mass of society—it may be, exclusive of the legal profession. And here, as in every case where theory is of any value, and experience can be relied on as authentic, theory and experience tell the same tale—both, as we conceive, attesting the superior qualifications conferred by education and practice.

It may first be advisable to examine the chief arguments advanced by the advocates of the jury system, and attempt to discover how far they are based on fallacies, and how far they are substantial and formidable considerations, not to be impugned, though they may be outweighed. One of the most important of these is the service rendered by jury-trial in training the intelligence of the people and eliciting their public spirit. The worth of all institutions in which political, judicial, or administrative power is thrown largely into the hands of ordinary citizens, lies in the fact that the due discharge of such functions calls men away for a time from the consideration of their private affairs, from attending merely to the advancement of their own fortunes or the acquirement for their family of a higher social grade, to reflections and actions having for their professed view the execution of a duty to society. All of us have much need to be occasionally recalled from the more urgent duties to our narrow circle, and awakened afresh to the remembrance that the welfare of the country of which we are members, greatly depends on the readiness of individuals to make sacrifices of their time and labour, in order to secure the due working of its social and political system. Not the least important part of the education of a free people is that which brings out by practice the qualities of deliberation, forethought, patriotism, and self-control—the moral qualities for securing which school training alone is far from adequate. A nation cannot be in a healthy and safe condition so long as the vigour that examines into abuses and defects, the wisdom and public spirit that seek to remedy them, are confined to a few officials. They may guard well for a time its privileges and liberties; *sed quis custodiet ipsos custodes?* What impulse urges a special class or a dynasty to labour for the perpetuation of good of which the nation is but the passive recipient? If ever the permanent prosperity of a country could be insured merely by the zeal of its rulers, that of Spain would have been insured by its first Bourbon kings. Philip V. found it bereft of the military glory of Ferdinand and Charles V., destitute of any counterbalancing internal welfare, and sunk so low that it needed the heads and mouths of foreigners to officer its armies, conduct its negotiations, and erect its public works. Its French kings summoned from England and Ireland, from France, Italy, and Germany, generals, financiers, and statesmen for the country of Alva and Gondomar. Under their rule, the fires of persecution were extinguished, the decaying military and naval powers restored, trade was encouraged by the introduction of foreign manufactures, and rivalry invited by the presence of foreign artisans; schools and colleges arose among an ignorant population; districts impassable for want of roads, and abandoned

to wild beasts and wilder men, became the seats of thriving inhabitants. But all was *for* the people, nothing *by* them. They remained inappreciative of their advantages; and when the stream of progress was cut off at its source by the accession of Charles IV., who "cared for none of these things," they hastened to retrace every step they had trodden in the direction of moral improvements, and suffered the material improvements to perish of neglect and disuse.

We do not, therefore, question that there is an element of utility in all institutions which, like trial by jury, involve public co-operation for public purposes. But we must remember that the benefit is here confined to a comparatively small number out of the whole population, and even to them occurs only at intervals. Our jury trials can exert no such wide effect, either in the way of intellectual exercise or of training to social duties, as the large dikasteries exerted on the quick-witted people of Athens. In a small state where the jury-list contained some 5000 names, the jury on every trial numbering a not inconsiderable fraction of these, and being left free to decide law as well as fact, it is clear that in the life of any ordinary citizen his judicial functions must have held a conspicuous place. But it would be absurd to attribute the same powerful influence to the small juries of modern times, selected from special classes, deciding on only such evidence as the judge shall suffer to be submitted to them, guided by him in the legal presumptions to be put on the facts, and having every question of law carefully withdrawn from their province. Moreover, the popular interest and instruction in law are not now, as at Athens, confined to the comparatively few who are in court during the trial. The press converts millions throughout the country into honorary jurors, and the credibility of a witness or the justice of a verdict, the truth of a Tichborne claimant or the innocence of a Pook, are earnestly and sensibly discussed over many a table at which no jurymen ever sits.

But even were the benefits greater, are we justified in imposing for the general good so heavy a burden on the individual citizen as his compulsory absence for an indefinite period from the employment by which he gains his livelihood? We are accustomed on other subjects to demand very clear proof of necessity before requiring so serious a sacrifice. We do not expect our ministers of state, our judges, or our generals—even though their service is voluntary—to act without a just remuneration. We have abandoned the impressment of seamen, which really, when examined, presents much similarity to the compulsory and ill-paid work of jurors. If we must have sailors for our navy, we recognise our duty to pay them sufficiently well to make it worth their while to serve us voluntarily. The payment of jurors



in the same way from the state funds would be a grievous charge on the taxpayer. Payment by the litigants (at the rate of a guinea a day for each juror) was lately tried for a few months, but it was soon found necessary to abolish a system so incompatible with cheap justice. If then we feel it unjust that men to whom their time is money—perhaps bread—should be subjected to a tax at once partial in its application, utterly uncertain in its amount, and dictated by no real necessity, we have a simple remedy in the removal of the jury system *in toto*.

The decision of a judge would not, it is said, command the confidence of the public so completely as that of twelve ordinary citizens. The probability of error is supposed to be diminished by the concurrence of so many minds in one verdict. Justice is held to be better secured by committing its administration to the hands of private individuals having no class interests which can lead to partial and narrow-minded decisions. We have not here to speak of the truth or error of these views; with that the whole of this article is occupied; our purpose is especially to consider how their prevalence, right or wrong, affects the desirability of the institution. We are told that in India, where juries are composed of five members, a popular proverb asserts that "where the five are, there is God;" but without an apotheosis of our English jury, it is no doubt a frequent opinion that where the twelve are, there is good sense, integrity, patience, impartiality. So desirable is it that the nation should feel a reliance on the excellence of its tribunals, and that their awards should not be received with sullen murmurings of "injustice" or "prejudice," that this popularity so long as it exists is a consideration of much moment in favour of trial by jury, though no reason for ceasing to urge a recognition of the superior merits of a different system. Should a more extended perception of these merits effect the displacement of our present mode of procedure, many of its remaining advocates would no doubt be led by experience and by custom to acknowledge the wisdom of the change. Already the thin end of the wedge has been introduced sufficiently far to excite some alarm in the panegyrists of the jury. In Chancery not only are the most knotty subjects ably dealt with by a Vice-Chancellor having, in many cases, no subsidiary body to share his labours, but even the chief clerks, holding no prominent public position, but having the advantage of a legal education, succeed in disposing satisfactorily and single-handed, of important interests and complicated entanglements. The county courts offer the advantage of a jury if either of the parties desires it; but in the majority of cases neither plaintiff nor defendant thinks it worth his while to incur the slight additional expense for such an end. Both sides

commonly remain contented with the decision of the judge. It is the judgments pronounced by qualified lawyers in courts of this character that are tending to supplant the jury in the mind of the nation ; probably, indeed, none would expect such a result from the unpaid magistrates, too often incompetent and prejudiced, who play at justice in our country villages.

Considerable stress is also laid by some on the influence exerted over a judge by the necessity of summing up to the jury the facts and arguments on which their verdict is to be based. Such a practice, it is justly contended, adds considerably to his motives for paying that continuous attention to the proceedings before him which his duty demands. But while recognising the desirability of the end, we are at issue on the necessity of a jury as the means. Would not the same result be equally well attained, compatibly with the solitary action of the judge, by an explanation in court of the reasons on which his decisions were founded? With counsel on both sides keeping careful guard over the correct statement of fact and the sequence of the argument, would not the judge feel himself under equally powerful obligations with the present to make sure of his ground, and to omit the consideration of no material circumstance ; nay, would he not feel even a more cogent obligation to such discharge of his duties when the decision of the suit lay totally in his hands? Would not the influence of professional opinion—possibly the most imperative sanction, after that of conscience, to which a judge is subject—be as hostile as now to any careless disregard of the public interests?

The same result is aimed at, and probably with much success, by the course imposed on the young men employed in the Indian Civil Service in the decision of suits between natives of India. Indeed, the labour imposed on them with this view is very considerable, it being in some cases demanded that not merely the grounds of decision, but the entire evidence should be written out by the judge with his own hand—a task of the greater labour from the fact that the proceedings which have been conducted in one language he must thus record in another.

But have we in trial by jury a guarantee against bribery of the tribunal? The affirmative of this question is maintained by many, and very naturally goes far in their minds to decide the whole point at issue. Of all the incidents that can disgrace the administration of so-called justice, corruption is the foulest. If a tribunal can be overawed by an individual or a mob, it speaks weakness in the judicature ; if its judgments are hostile to good sense, and are the utterance of hasty ignorance, it speaks folly ; but neither weakness nor folly is so discreditable, or so calculated to destroy the spirit of obedience to law as the knowledge that

the judges are "receivers of gifts and followers after rewards," who judge not the cause of the poor. To overpowering brute force even excellent men may yield—even the most upright may pronounce what in the eyes of others is an absurd opinion, but a lack of heroism, though it should amount to timidity, and incompetency, though it were ridiculous, are scarcely, we think, so debasing as the spirit that would sell justice "for so much trash as may be grasped thus." Would the replacement of juries by judges throw open the door to such profligacy? There are many who affirm that it would. If we look no further than the present day, it is, of course, a mere subject for speculation; for no sane man would for a moment contend that a breath of suspicion on the subject of corruption ever taints the able and eminent judges who dispose of important interests without further aid, any more than those from whom the question of fact is passed on to a jury. But however unfamiliar to ourselves in these times, the corrupt judge is a prominent figure in all history. He is not of the extinct species which we may safely relegate to some antediluvian distance; he has existed in our land, still exists in others, nor have we any certain proof that the shameful days of judicial bribery will never return. Now, a single judge, it is argued, is far more open to solicitations of this nature than a dozen jurymen, unknown to the litigants except for so long a time as they occupy the box, can possibly be. Those who would offer a bribe to the former are under no uncertainty to whom they must resort. Against him the would-be corrupters could direct their aims at their leisure, could meet him in the privacy of his own dwelling-house, where they would avoid the difficulty and the hazard of detection and failure consequent on an attempt to seduce the jurors.

But we fear it is forgotten that supposing the difficulty of exerting any direct influence over the jurors to be as great as is imagined, there have been and would again be found means of exerting indirect. The charge which at one period figured in an attorney's bill of costs, "for the goodwill of the sheriff," is an ominous and significant item. If it were impossible to bribe the jurors, would it be equally so to bribe the sheriff who selects the jurors? Every packed jury that has sat since the practice of packing juries first arose is a proof that those who would bring unlawful influence to bear are fully capable of suiting their plans to the exigency of the occasion. And to what purpose would it be to close one door in the way of corruption and leave another standing wide open—or in the metaphor of Milton, to attempt pounding up the crows by shutting the park gate? And further, we much question whether if the spirit of corruption should ever again infest our law courts, those whom it animated

would not discover some ingenious method of acquainting the jury that a favourable verdict would be likely to elicit tokens of gratitude from a wealthy suitor. It might in some cases be impossible to pay the juror in advance the wages of his iniquity; but how would this fact secure us the wished-for purity were there a covert intimation in the special case, or a well-established practice by which the occupants of the box could be assured that their verdict might be safely sold in reliance on a subsequent remuneration? That such a practice at one time prevailed, according to which the party in whose favour a verdict was pronounced rewarded the jury by a payment and a feast is shown by a remarkable letter written to Archbishop Sancroft by his attorney, while the jury engaged in the trial of the Seven Bishops were still in deliberation. The reverend character of the person to whom it is addressed may convince us that the objectionable custom was so well established as to be almost deemed one of the ordinary or necessary expenses.

"In case," says Mr. Ince, "a verdict pass for us (which God grant in his own best time) the present consideration will be, how the jury shall be treated. The course is usually, each man so many guineas and a common dinner for them all. The quantum is at your Grace's and my Lords' direction. But it seems to my poor understanding that the dinner might be spared, lest our watchful enemies interpret our entertainment of the jury for a public exultation and a seditious meeting: and so it may be ordered thus;—Each man — guineas for his trouble, and each man a guinea over for his own desire; with my Lords' order that I or some other entreat them, in your names, not to dine together for the reasons aforesaid. . . . There were twenty-two of the jury appeared and no more; and they that did not serve will expect a reward as well as those who did. . . . There must be a hundred and fifty or two hundred guineas provided."\*

In cases where the offer of a bribe was of a more naked character, there is no reason to suppose that the necessity under which the jury might lie of waiting for the receipt of it until their own share of the contract was irrevocably performed by bringing in the verdict, would be an obstacle to a bargain for which, in the case supposed, both parties would be eager. Such compacts are well observed, partly from that sense of honour which prevails even among thieves, partly from the mutual unwillingness to impair a system in which both offenders find their present interest. Just as these two causes may not improbably frustrate the best Ballot Bill we may devise for the prevention of electoral bribery, so would they be sufficient to enable juror and litigant to come to an understanding. We know that it is not a necessary condition for the prevalence of bribery that a

---

\* "D'Oyly's Life of Sancroft," vol. i. pp. 306-7.

complete sale and purchase should take place *uno ictu*; and except under a system of voting papers, or the Italian scheme of which Mr. Gladstone a while ago became enamoured, one or other of the conspirators must trust to the honour or self-interest of the other.

If then either by poisoning the stream at its source—by tampering with the sheriff who summons the panel—or by a direct engagement by words or signs between the litigants and the jurors, a channel could be constructed to convey the influence of the long purse, which, we may ask, would be the more likely to yield to such dishonest advances, the juror or the judge? The one occupies a high social position, that ensures him a permanent and extensive reputation. The other may be, and frequently is, unknown beyond the neighbourhood where he pursues his calling. The single judge must bear on his own shoulders the burden of self-reproach, and cannot extenuate his offence by dividing with others his guilt. The juror has the consolation of thinking that he is no worse than eleven others, and that it is only the part of a fool to be righteous overmuch. The former by his education and public station cannot be ignorant of the most elementary duty incumbent on an administrator of justice, or be unaware that in donning his ermine robe and assuming his dignified position, he acknowledges the cogent claims which the nation has on his justice and impartiality. The latter would probably reflect, as many who make a profit of their votes reflect now, that the nation is nothing to him, and that his first duty is to make a good provision for his wife and children.

We do not find in the ancient republics that the sphere of corruption has been determined by the presence or absence of a single judge, or an extensive tribunal. Out of the fifty-six senators, tribunes, and knights, who on the motion of Fufius assembled to sit in judgment on the alleged sacrilege of Clodius, there were found no less than thirty-one to accept the gold of Clodius and his assistant gladiator. The Athenian dikasteries appear indeed to have been less chargeable with this disgraceful incident—an honourable distinction, which (so far as it is attributable to artificial contrivances) was owing partly to the selection by lot of the persons who should compose them, and partly also, it may be, to the remarkably large number of their members. Here again, however, little can perhaps be inferred from the inability of corruption to cope with masses of 200 or 300 men, to warrant the belief that there is in the small bodies with which we in England are familiar any guarantee against the dominion of the "almighty dollar." What English juries have been, we need not fall back upon mere conjecture to determine. In the statutes of the Plantagenets and Tudors repeated

allusion is made to the sale by juries of their verdicts, and the perjury which such an offence involved, and repeated provisions are enacted against what was evidently an habitual and deeply-rooted practice. Thus by 3 Edw. I. c. 38, which remarks, that "certain people of this realm doubt very little to make a false oath (which they ought not to do), whereby much people are disinherited and lose their right,"\* provision is made for applying a remedy in cases relating to landed property by writ of attaint. This remedy was extended by 1 Edw. III. c. 7, which directly names "the mischiefs, damage, and destruction that hath happened to divers persons, as well of holy church as others, by the false oaths of jurors in writs of trespass." In the 5th and 28th years of the same reign additional enactments are found relating to this subject. In the 34th year it was judged expedient to grant the same redress to owners of personal estate as had been hitherto confined to cases affecting real property—to offer the remedy gratuitously to those who should sue for it *in formâ pauperis* (the class that perhaps needed most protection against the silver spears that vanquished the integrity of jurors), and to impose heavy penalties on the offenders. Four years later the bribers—technically known as embraceors—were subjected to the same penalty as the jurymen, who were at the same time to forfeit ten times the amount of the bribe.† Still was the Legislature far enough from having exorcised the demon of corruption; the damning evidence of the statute book against the ancient juries was still far from being completed. The 11 Hen. VI. c. 4, which facilitates yet more the remedy by attaint, commences with this emphatic language: "Item, our Lord the King, by the grievous complaint of his Commons, considering the mischiefs had within the realm, and yet not remedied, and also the great damage and disherison that cometh by the usual perjury of jurors impanelled upon inquests, as well in the courts of our Lord the King as of other, the which perjury doth abound and increase daily more than it was wont, for the great gifts that such jurors take of the parties in pleas sued in the said courts," &c. Similar complaints of the prevalence of this grievance, and further elaboration or continuation of means for its prevention, are contained in a series of statutes‡ of which the first dwells on "the great fearless and shameless perjury which horribly continueth and daily increaseth in the common juries of

---

\* The remedy, and the subsequent enactments on the subject, clearly point to the perjury of jurors, and not of witnesses, as that aimed at by this Act.

† See also 9 Ric. II., c. 3.

‡ See 15 Hen. VI. c. 5; 18 Hen. VI. c. 2; 3 Hen. VII. c. 1; 11 Hen. VII. cc. 21 and 24; 19 Hen. VII. c. 3; 23 Hen. VIII. c. 3; 37 Hen. VIII. cc. 5 and 23.

the said realm," and one so late as 1531, says of jurors, that "perjury in the land is in manifold causes by unreasonable means detestably used." The evidence is not confined to acts of Parliament. Mr. Barrington, speaking of the time of Henry VII., remarks: "In the Dance of Death, written originally in French by Macharel, and translated by John Lydgate, in this reign, with some additions to adapt it to English characters, a jurymen is mentioned who had been bribed for giving a false verdict, which shows the offence to have been very common." Stow, he tells us, "complains that this crying offence continued in the time of Queen Elizabeth, when he wrote his account of London." Even in much more modern times, we find by 7 & 8 Will. III. c. 32, that "by partiality and favour of sheriffs, the corruption of officers, and many other evil practices, the service of jurors has been found to be very burdensome and grievous;" and in 3 Geo. II. c. 25, "many evil practices have been used in corrupting of jurors returned for the trial of issues." We recommend these facts to the attention of all who consider a single judge as the only target accessible to the shafts of bribery, and reserve all their encomiums for "the sturdy and honest jurymen," ignorant that he has in his day shared the vices of the bench, and was then on a par with it in corruption, as in the more conscientious discharge of public duty which marks the present time, he is on a par with it in integrity.

But what are the positive charges to be brought against the system of jury trial? Some indeed have been inevitably implicated in the discussion of its real or supposed advantages. Examining first its suitability for the occurrences of everyday life, in a time when the clangour of political disputes is not heard, and the apprehension of any interference from the ruling power is out of the question, we are forced to the conviction that a jury possesses far less ability than would be displayed by a trained judge. The latter is a man, who by a laborious education has been taught concentration of attention, and the power of grasping a protracted and complete subject which will stagger and confuse a non-professional man wholly unused to such difficulties. In the course of his practice at the bar, it has been his ordinary employment to interrogate witnesses, or listen to their interrogations, to note the characteristic marks of honest and of lying evidence, to seize on the minute indications and casual expressions unconsciously let fall which suggest undisclosed but most important considerations—the buoys floating on the surface which betray the rocks hidden beneath. For such purposes, in addition to his own experience, he has enjoyed the advantage of consulting writers who have directed their special attention to such topics. He has been no solitary recluse

shut up with his tomes of statutes and case law, and proposing to solve every question suggested to him by some *à priori* theory, of which he has never had an opportunity of testing the validity. On the contrary he has, in his days of advocacy, been engaged in the consideration of practical domestic and commercial questions; he has had opportunities of observing the conduct of men of business, and consequently is enabled to import into the examination of conflicting evidence a knowledge of the antecedent probability of the circumstances to which testimony is borne. Such are his intellectual qualifications; and what can an ordinary juror show as a counterpoise? If he happens to be a really well-educated man, or to be possessed of unusual natural endowments, he may bring to the subject the mental vigour necessary to cope with an elaborate discussion; but in very few cases will the business of his life have enforced on him the habit of estimating evidence, or even placed him where the formation of such a habit was possible. There are indeed those who fancy that because the questions coming before a juror involve for the most part occurrences in trade and other ordinary affairs of a like nature, familiarity with the subject matter will serve the same purpose as simplicity in the point at issue; as though it were not equally possible that contradictory statements and elaborate complications should arise out of the most homely, as out of the most recondite facts. As well might it be supposed that the sciences which are conversant about the facts most inseparably connected with the experience of every man—the sciences of the human body and the human mind—must be naturally the most easy, instead of being, as is really the case, among the most arduous of all sciences. Thus for example, a fundamental truth of physiology, the ignorance of which one would suppose must have essentially vitiated the conclusions of all previous physicians, owes its discovery, as all know, to the comparatively recent investigations of Harvey. And the human mind has afforded to metaphysicians and thinkers of all ages the battle ground where, one after another, hard-fought conflicts have died out undecided, to be replaced by others equally incapable of a determinate solution; the object of attack ever remaining, like the forms of Milton's spirits—

“Incapable of mortal injury,  
Imperishable, and though pierced with wound,  
Soon closing, and by native vigour healed.”

Just so these familiar subjects may, and frequently do, present to those engaged in the administration of law, complexities which it needs far higher training to unravel than is commonly enjoyed by English citizens, or by the agricultural smockfrocks



in whom the admiring eye of Sir Edward Creasy discerns a sterling intelligence fully capacitating them for the task—a conclusion strangely at variance with the testimony of some other witnesses, who attribute to them a stolid stupidity unparalleled among the peasants of Europe.\*

The credibility of witnesses is far from being so simple a question as many represent it. To judge of the veracity of a single speaker often needs an intimate familiarity with facts that can scarcely become known but to one practised in conducting, or at least in witnessing, examinations. To construe aright the expression of the features, the readiness or the hesitation of the voice, the calmness or the agitation of manner, is all work for no unskilled hand. Many may interpret the blush of wronged innocence as the sign of a guilty conscience, or mistake the confusion of a nervous man subjected to a searching cross-examination for the inconsistency of an ill-framed lie. Nor is it an easy task to separate the actual occurrence from the distorting haze or delusive colours in which (sometimes with perfect good faith) each party may clothe it, under the influence of statements misunderstood, or ideas only half expressed. Two honourable men who have met to discuss some friendly arrangement and parted, as they believe, with a perfectly distinct understanding, will, on a subsequent examination, be frequently found to have carried away such discordant views of the conclusion arrived at as will baffle any but the most experienced inquirer. The discrepancy will often match that of the observers in Merrick's fable, who disputed on the colour of the chameleon, and perhaps without the possibility of "producing the beast" for the termination of the dispute. We have evidence arrayed against the direct counterpart of itself, assertion met by point-blank denial. An attorney taking a cause down to trial in ignorance of the ground to be taken by his adversary, will in vain prepare an address on what appears to him as clear as the sun in heaven; he must be prepared to hear a flat contradiction given to every material fact on which he relies, and be ready to shape his course anew at a moment's notice, to meet an array of circumstances the reverse of what he has been led to anticipate. To cope with such embarrassments as these calls for well-trained abilities, and not a little forensic experience.†

---

\* See for example Mr. Cliffe Leslie's "Land Systems of Ireland, England," &c.

† The eminent Professor Austin, when urging the value of legal training as a mental discipline, and supporting it against the rival claims of mathematics, remarks that the analogical processes by which existing rules are extended in practice to new cases "show that no study can so form the mind to reason justly and readily from analogy as that of law. And accordingly it is a matter of common remark that lawyers are the best judges of evidence with regard to matter of fact in existence."

Not the least valuable among the acquirements of a judicial lawyer in his training at the bar is the knowledge how to estimate at its due worth the rhetoric of the advocate. The eloquence which counts for so much in addressing the passions of a jury would be thrown away in arguing with the reason of a judge: indeed, there can be little doubt it would receive the severe rebuke which would speedily teach the man of mere words that his occupation was gone. "There is no side box here, Brother ——" would be, as it has elsewhere been, the only reward for the mellifluous or energetic commonplaces which tend but to confuse and distract attention from the real point at issue. The sole reliable guide in judicial or any other investigations must be an accurate comparison and weighing of reasons on the one side and on the other; however serviceable ridicule, pathos, invective may be as the supports and allies of this, they must be like the military power in a State—kept in constant subordination to the civil; they must only be allowed to work their effect when it has been ascertained that they are employed in aid of justice and reason; nor can this process be reversed without the risk of ultimately discovering that our warm-hearted enthusiasm has been unhappily misdirected, and resulted in effects precisely the reverse of those anticipated. Most of all is this true of judicial inquiries where the aim is mainly—in theory it is entirely—to apply to actual cases the law, the expediency or justice of which it rests with another body to determine. But the attorney who prepares to take a case down to Westminster before a jury, seeks to retain the services, not of the counsellor who can most perfectly stand the test of reason and logic, but the man who can play most skilfully on the feelings, can impressively deliver a good speech, and enlist the prejudices or sympathies of his twelve hearers where they ought above all to cast those sympathies or prejudices aside. The very fact is a blot on the jury system. As it is a gross insult to offer a judge a bribe for a judgment that ought to be in no way influenced by cupidity, so is it an insult to proffer groundless flattery or rhetoric for a verdict that ought to be gained solely by reason. A tribunal which can without injustice be so insulted is therein eminently inferior to judges who, experienced in the manufacture and management of the forensic machinery, rate the stage effects at their true worth, and who would reward such attempts to juggle with the bench with merited contempt.

As we have alluded to the superiority of the Greek tribunals as instruments of popular training, and to their honourable freedom from corruption, we may observe that they had also in an exaggerated degree the deficiencies of which we complain. Before them the power of oratory, the artifices of the rhetorician, [Vol. XCVII. No. CXCII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. XLI. No. II. X

the voices of relatives of the accused, falling on their knees and with clasped hands and streaming tears interceding on behalf of a husband or a father, drowned and stifled the dictates of pure reason. All that could move the sympathies, or appeal to the prejudices of the dikasts, all that could distract attention to irrelevant topics, all the "slander, pity, and indignation," which Aristotle justly repudiated as foreign to the subject, were diligently pressed into the service of the litigants. The rhetoricians who composed addresses to be delivered by the parties in their own support needed not to trouble themselves with arguments that would bear the test of calm consideration, but filled up their discourses with such topics as most powerfully enlisted the feelings of the tribunal for the moment. The same object was aimed at in Rome, when the friends of a prisoner, or, it may be, persons hired for the purpose, donned mourning apparel and went disconsolately about the city to elicit compassion for their unhappy acquaintance. In Athens, where the dikasts were judges of law as well as of fact, the law also was argued on every ground that could win a ready decision, not as regards what it was, but what it should be; and utterly disregarding precedent and adjudicating every case on its own merits, they thus, as Mr. Maine has pointed out, rendered it impossible that Greece should ever supplement her other bequests to posterity with a well-constructed system of law.

In nothing probably is the influence of education more beneficially displayed than in the degree in which it elevates the mind above popular prejudices. The man whose training has made him aware of the slight grounds which many generally received opinions have for their support; who, by mixing with educated men and informing his mind with standard literature, has become accustomed to see opposite views long and ably maintained, each with its own appropriate and powerful arguments, and has come to feel that idiosyncrasies are not to be viewed askance and with suspicion merely because they are idiosyncrasies—still less that they demand to be sternly frowned down and suppressed whenever they take an outward embodiment in action—this man will be so much the better qualified to enter on the examination of a judicial question apart from that bias which many will entertain against unusual conduct or unpopular classes. Perhaps in a higher degree than he enjoys freedom from prejudice he will entertain a suspicion of prejudice; he will be scrupulous about yielding to the bias of which he may be unable to divest himself, and will strive to hold the balance of justice fairly in the centre, and restrain his own hand when it would involuntarily tilt the scale. The absence of prejudice is what the most candid cannot secure; but he will re-

member, and make allowance for, its existence; just as the political economist who arrives at his general theories by considering only the more permanent and universal of the agencies at work, must, if he would apply his results to any advantage, take up again into account the modifying circumstances which, though omitted, can never be safely forgotten. To be conscious of a prejudice and omit it from consideration is to surpass the folly of Don Quixote himself; for even he would not go out to fight with a pasteboard helmet of which he doubted the strength, but persisted in first making trial of it, and hewed it in two in the process.

An example of the mode in which prejudice is suffered to sway the decisions of the box is afforded by the treatment which railway companies receive at the hands of jurors. In any action against such a body the defendants have to bear up against a strong bias, due partly to the greater ease with which sympathy is excited for the loss of a husband or the destruction of an individual's property than for the pocket of a commercial body, partly to the feeling that a few hundred pounds is little for a company to pay and a considerable sum for a poor man to receive, partly it may be to a real or supposed neglect by the companies of popular interests, whence springs a wish to retaliate without regard to the merits of the case in hand—the company's necessity being the public's opportunity. On a recent occasion, when a counsel arguing that certain evidence against a railway company should have been submitted to the jury, remarked that he was sure not a jury could be called in England but would assign it great weight, one of the bench intimated that not a jury could be called in England but would take every opportunity of finding a verdict against such a company. Again, in districts where religious animosities run to a height, an upright judge would seek to close his mind entirely to the dictates of sectarianism, where a jury yields to them, probably with self-approval. We are told that in Ireland, when a jury is summoned to try a violation of the Party Processions Act, or any offence involving the passions of Romanists and Protestants, the issue can in general be predicted as soon as it is known of whom the tribunal is composed. Romanist will acquit Romanist and condemn Protestant—Protestant will treat Romanist with equal justice—if the jury be divided in religion they will also be divided in their judgment, and the disciples of parson and of priest can unite in no verdict. Mr. Taylor, in his standard treatise on evidence, commenting on the frequent utility of producing in court the instruments or other objects to be identified, observes that such evidence must be used with caution.

"The minds of jurymen," he proceeds, "especially in the remote

provinces, are grievously open to prejudices; and the production of a bloody knife, a bludgeon, or a burnt piece of rag, may sometimes, by exciting the passions or enlisting the sympathies of the jury, lead them to overlook the necessity of proving in what manner these articles are connected with the criminal or the crime, and they consequently run no slight risk of arriving at conclusions which, for want of some link in the evidence, are by no means warranted by the facts proved."

Just as Chatterton's fellow-townsmen considered that he had crushed Johnson's scepticism as to the antiquity of the Rowley poems by triumphantly pointing to the chest in the tower of St. Mary Redcliffe, where they were said to have been discovered.

There are some who maintain the strange opinion that education is an actual impediment in dealing with questions of daily life—an obstacle to rendering a decision in accordance with the dictates of "common sense." Men of education sometimes participate in the notion that to pursue a regular course of study tends to warp the mind and induce the habit of regarding every subject through professional spectacles. The learned man, they say, has lost that freshness and originality, that power of coming down with a trenchant blow, cutting through the fine cobwebs of sophistry, and roughly but readily, and in the main justly, severing right from wrong—which is the prerogative of unsophisticated mother wit. Just as the savage who before he can eat his day's meal must resort to a hundred expedients to ensnare some wild bird, or track a subtle beast, and so is fertile in devices for extricating himself from dilemmas where a civilized man would stand utterly bewildered, and is alive to discovering his enemy by slight tokens that would escape the ablest detective—so the business of daily life (it is maintained) cultivates to a high pitch the observation and practical sagacity which in those "bewildered in the maze of schools" are first hidden and then choked up by the luxuriant artificial growth around them.

To this we would reply that it presupposes the education imparted to be a very erroneous or, at least, a very partial one. The ideal purpose of mental training is not to bury knowledge in the mind as treasure may be buried in the earth, to fructify no more than the gold does, and with a likelihood, to which the gold is not exposed, of decaying by neglect; but rather to sow knowledge as seed destined to bring forth its fruit according to the character and fertility of the soil that receives it; to impart not only thoughts but thought—the power to originate, discard, or amend thoughts; the power to distinguish between a subtle sophism and a cogent argument, and to correct the crude generalizations which men are at all times so hasty to form, by confronting them with individual phenomena, and deducing their remoter consequences. Surely these are habits, to none more

indispensable than to him who is called on to administer justice and decide on the weight to be attached to evidence. Compared with these we should say, with Ferrier, that common sense means simply common nonsense. But it may be retorted that these considerations do not go to the root of the matter ; that the complaint is not of the unsuitability of men educated on an ideal and perfect, but on an actual and imperfect system ; and that the ordinary culture of a judge is so far from realizing the conditions already referred to that it is practically inferior to the less instructed wisdom of the twelve. If this be indeed the import of the objection, it is difficult to see what facts can be alleged in its proof. For the legal education, as we have already remarked, is not that of a recluse or a bookworm, but unites with knowledge of the law experience in the practice of daily life ; and were the comparative merits of judges and jurymen to be estimated solely with reference to the opportunities they have had of drawing wisdom from the source of their own experience, the decision would still be in favour of the judges.

The evil of incompetency and prejudice does not end with the injustice of a single case decided on wrong principles. Whatever diminishes the efficiency and accessibility of the tribunals, whatever renders it less probable that justice will be dealt out equally to all, is to that extent a discouragement to those who would seek from the law the redress of their wrongs. Such as are familiar with the common law courts know that a sound case may easily fail to find favour in the eyes of a jury, and that to take a dispute down to Westminster or the Guildhall in reliance on its absolute merits as discussed by the light of strict reason and law, is to subject it to a cloud of disturbing influences, the result of which it is often impossible to predict. Hence many who are well acquainted with the defects of such a system are led to prefer a compromise to so uncertain an encounter. So much the better, it will be replied ; there will be a check on litigation. A check on litigation !—the constant palliative for all that makes the remedies offered by law either costly or tardy or uncertain. What is litigation, under just laws, but the most rational and constitutional course of securing obedience to those laws ? Its alternatives, wherever a serious wrong has been inflicted, are either the strong hand that is at once accuser, judge, and executive officer—the violent remedy, open only to those powerful or cunning enough to take or wealthy enough to purchase their security, which it is the glory of civilization to replace by the impartial judgment of outsiders—or else the patient submission to all that insolence and tyranny may inflict. It is indeed the duty of a civilized country to provide as far as possible that litigation shall not be perverted into an instrument for the revenge-

ful punishment of trifles or accidents; but where a doubt really exists of the law, or where a manifest wrong is committed, an appeal to the decision or the protection of law is no crime to be frowned down. To place obstacles in the way of obtaining justice is to offer a premium to injury and dishonesty. The latter has enough loopholes—we might rather say, great gates standing wide open for its escape from penalties—to render it needless to discourage still further the claimant of his just rights. The fraudulent is left free to incur debts of which the law provides his creditor with no process for compelling the repayment unless he be capable of speaking to the means of the man whom he trusted—as though to demand the repayment of moneys with which one has temporarily accommodated his neighbour were presumptively unreasonable and harsh, and to refuse the repayment were *primâ facie* rational and just. The law suffers the bankrupt who has fraudulently squandered the money of others, and is a thief under a softer name, to start again free and unencumbered on the road to riches, and to be rolling in wealth on which his unpaid creditor can never lay a finger. All such scandalous defects are so many free licences given to the unjust—so many abrogations of one main purpose of society, which is to enable the injured to obtain legal redress. And it is as co-operating in this eminently unfavourable result that we protest against the unreliability imported into a tribunal by the presence of members frequently ill-educated and prejudiced.

A judge is also under greater inducements than a dozen jurors to exert his utmost skill and impartiality. His is a conspicuous, theirs a comparatively obscure position. He has a judicial reputation to sustain among his brother judges and the profession at large; in them no one expects, or is surprised or indignant not to find, high legal ability. The reputation that will most naturally fall in their way, and to which their attention will be mainly directed, will be that of commercial skill and uprightness in supplying the necessities of their neighbourhood or the mercantile world at large. He stands alone; or at least is one of a small number, each of whom acts for himself, and in many cases declares severally his opinion. The jurymen are lost and undistinguished among his fellows: he is one of the integrant drops of which nothing is known except as they are formed into a collective mass. The double eminence of the judge, conspicuous alike by his elevated position and the fewness if not the absence of coadjutors, is a powerful motive for his bringing to bear his utmost abilities, and adds to the call of duty the potent influence of self-interest. Nor is his reputation necessarily limited to his contemporaries. He has before him the possibility of acquiring a fame in which posterity will take an interest, of ranking with

the Hales and Mansfields and Eldons as one whose legal acumen shed a lustre on the bench of his country. What historian, even what legal historian, will know of the sagacity which Mr. Smith or Mr. Brown displayed in piercing through the complexities of the suit submitted to them? Who will ever trouble himself to discover the jurors' names? The circumstances may have led to the enunciation of a general principle, and may consequently live for some future counsel to support his client by a reference to the well-known case of *Noakes v. Styles*; but the jurors who pronounced on its facts will have rather less of the pleasures of fame than the recruiting sergeant in "*Barnaby Rudge*" promised to the rustic, who if killed should have his name written down in a great book at the War Office, and be loved by King George III. and the country.

Let us not be misunderstood as expressing a belief that such general celebrity is a necessary condition for securing diligence in public duties of the nature of a juror's; still less as for a moment countenancing the supposition that such *ought* to be the chief springs of action in this or any other office, and that obscurity can excuse the negligent discharge of useful and honourable labours. We merely maintain that a judge having such fame to earn or to support is additionally likely to bring to them all his energies; which indeed we fear that it is not always possible to exert to the utmost degree under a cold though conscientious desire to do right when the heart is not in the work. It is surely justifiable to enlist the "last infirmity of noble minds" in aid of the voice of religion and duty; just as publicity is often an indispensable advantage, although its utility rests mainly on the assumption that men will do from regard to their fellow creatures what they might not do through reverence for their conscience or their God.

The Scotch jury, as is well known, consists of fifteen members, and judgment goes according to the verdict of a certain majority. The system is preferable to our own in its freedom from the dilemma that must be often presented, of perjury on the one hand, and on the other an inability to concur in a verdict. According to the encomiasts of the English jury, and indeed according to the theory of the English law, it is on the "unanimous concurrence of twelve men" that we are to rely as strong evidence of a correct result; but this unanimity puts on a very different aspect and becomes far more insignificant when we remember the probability that an impatient minority may have yielded—as surely they have often done—their consciences and their opinions to an equally impatient majority. Moreover, that twelve men should concur in an opinion is a strong argument in its favour only when that opinion is arrived at by persons



having some considerable independence of thought, and between whom there is a sufficient mental diversity to render it probable that the views of one are not a mere *facsimile* of the views of another. If there be any general uniformity of character in that class from which the jurors are drawn, we must not put their unanimity on a par in point of significance with the concurrent decision of twelve men selected at hazard whose training, modes of thought, feelings, and points of view are so varied, that their accordance in one result can hardly be accounted for except by the existence of powerful reasons in its favour. The difference is comparable to that between going over the steps of a calculation a second or third time, and checking the result by working from the beginning on a different method; and no schoolboy who is advanced in ciphering need be told which course affords the stronger presumption of accuracy.

The old process for arriving at the boasted unanimity by subjecting the jurors to the slow torture of cold and hunger, having for some time fallen into disuse, is now by the Jurors' Act of 1870 directly discarded. It was about as sensible in principle as the more vigorous practice of the Polish Diet, where recalcitrant members were hewn in two with a sword. But when coercion is abandoned, it seems to us that both the English and Scotch systems involve evils from which a trial by one or a greater number of judges is more free. The defect of the English jury is the liability to an irreconcilable difference of opinion, and a consequent inability to bring in any verdict—a gratifying result truly to both parties after a heavy outlay has been incurred in invoking the aid of law; the Scotch system involves the possibility of a verdict being hastily returned without deliberation as soon it is found to possess the needful majority. One or more judges would be free from the besetting danger of an upright English jury, while by the practice of stating the grounds of their decision, a barrier would be placed in the way of ill-considered judgments.

The defects on which we have commented it is of course the tendency of trial by jury to correct. The occupation of jurymen strengthens the habits and powers required, as most powers are strengthened by exercise. But there is certainly something objectionable in this method of practising on the live subject. It must be a grim species of satisfaction to the *corpus vile*—the luckless plaintiff or defendant on whom an inexperienced or incompetent jury has passed an unreasonable decision—to reflect that this is all excellent practice for them, and in time to come some happy suitor may enjoy the benefit of the experience gained at his expense. Where experience can be acquired by no other means, we must accept the unfortunate necessity; but surely

when it is feasible, drill should precede war, rehearsal should precede acting, and acquaintance with the courts as a listening and a practising barrister should precede the exercise of judicial functions.

The almost unanimous opposition offered by the judges to the amelioration of our criminal law has created in many a feeling unfavourable to their administration of justice. It is thought that a law which disgraced the Statute Book, and called loudly for repeal would, if entrusted solely to the bench, be enforced with inexorable severity. Whether it be that familiarity with the harsh sentence would deaden the sense of its injustice, or that to the conservatism of age, time-honoured legal rules would carry their own justification, or that a stern sense of the oath they had sworn, to administer the actual law, would hold them to the letter that killeth—whatever the cause, their dynasty, it is feared, would be marked by a lamentable adherence to provisions condemned by the nation and needing instant abolition. But does not all this imply a wish to confer on one functionary the duties bestowed on another? There is already an officer in whom the prerogative of mercy is practically vested. Why seek to transform a criminal judge into a Home Secretary? Is it of no moment that the judge swears (not to reform, but) to administer the law, the jury to return a true verdict, according (not to the penalty they would think it best to impose, but) to the evidence? If such an oath is justifiably exacted, what can the superior praise bestowed on a lenient jury over a rigid judge signify, but that the former has made light of its solemn obligation? Is it by countenancing a well-intentioned perjury that we shall maintain the sanctity of the law? And all for what? That a law which Parliament considers it advisable still to maintain should be left indeed on the Statute Book, but covertly evaded in conformity with the wisdom of the jury-box. A law left in this predicament, sometimes enforced, sometimes disregarded—its penalty not merely commuted to a more lenient one, but entirely escaped—is perhaps in the most pernicious state conceivable. It still has here and there its stray victims, where some accident or individual peculiarity has withheld from them the mercy afforded to others, but their punishment is no longer a stern warning to similar offenders, for these know that the chances are in favour of their escape, and with the common hopefulness of speculators, estimate their risk at even too low a figure. Where punishment is worth enforcing, it is worth enforcing consistently and by rule; and nothing can more speedily and surely clash with the moral feelings of the community than to see equal guilt visited with different and arbitrary punishments, and at times none at all.

The more ample reforms which, thanks to Sir Samuel Romilly, have been effected in our penal laws, have swept away those odious severities which of old provoked the perjury we have alluded to. Little occasion now remains for any difference between the practice of jury and of judge. The chief instance is the treatment of infanticide; and if the hostility to all capital punishment should grow in strength as years go on, it is probable that in trials for murder generally, we shall see verdicts given by sentiment against truth. On the utility of such punishment, we confess our belief that the deliberate wisdom of Parliament, capable of looking calmly at the remote effects, and estimating the influence on society at large, is more to be trusted than the feelings of twelve individuals, coming direct from the sight of a poor wretch, or it may be a cruelly-wronged girl, trembling on the brink of futurity, and with a pitiable appeal for mercy still ringing in their ears, setting themselves to judge (for so in fact they must do) on an important point of criminal law, in opposition to the views of the ablest statesmen and most far-sighted philanthropists.

The objections to jury trial, however, are far from possessing the same weight in cases of murder, or the more heinous crimes, as in ordinary civil causes. A modern English jury will no doubt in such cases earnestly endeavour to bring into the box careful and unprejudiced minds—will listen with patient attention to the comments of the bench—to which when they defer, they may be useless, but cannot be seriously detrimental—will be little subjected to the distracting rhetoric of the bar, at least on the part of the prosecution, and probably if they do err, will err on the side of mercy. If the sole alternative were a single judge, then to lay on one man the undivided responsibility of decreeing away a life were needlessly to impose a cruel burden. It can be no slight trial to the feelings of a humane man to pronounce the summing-up, which will seriously influence the momentous decision; it is hard to assume the black cap, and solemnly adjure the felon to seek from Heaven the mercy he must not hope from man; but the judge is at least free from the painful thought that his unsupported and fallible voice may haply have consigned the innocent to a disgraceful doom. And at the same time the public might not unreasonably think the opinion of a single individual, labouring (for aught that might be known) under temporary ill-health that obscured his faculties, or private anxieties that embittered his disposition, an unsatisfactory ground for an irrevocable judgment. The same objections however would not apply, or in far less strong a degree, to a trial before several judges, uniting the guarantee of number to the advantages of legal training. If sentence only followed

on the unanimous concurrence of three judges, their decision would certainly merit the sincere respect of the nation. The independence of judgment which is shown by the readiness of the bench to express divergent opinions, and which the most cursory inspection of law reports will attest, leaves little cause to fear that such unanimity would be arrived at without adequate reasons. It is also to be ever borne in mind that where as in England the law is not excessively harsh, the desideratum in a judicial system is not mercy, nor severity, but simply and exactly justice; that it is no recommendation to a jury, if (as is perhaps commonly supposed), the accused has with them a better chance of escape; the real question being—which is the tribunal most likely to acquit the innocent, and also condemn the guilty? It is raising a false issue to ask, if I were on my trial, whom should I prefer as my judges? unless the inquirer can feel assured that he would in such a case have no partiality to a lenient tribunal, and if really a burglar or murderer, would hope (for the good of his country) that he should be imprisoned or hung. But the superior merits of official judges would be most prominently brought out in cases—to which we shall afterwards more fully allude—which involve the prejudices of the multitude, and the number of which tends to increase with the increasing power of the multitude in modern times.

We have not yet spoken of the possibility of intimidation and Crown influence, as affecting the merits of the two modes of trial. And this immediately introduces us to a great and important branch of our subject.

We sometimes hear that it is not in days of tranquillity and order, "when all things are prosperous with us," that we can fully realize the advantages which flow from this popular institution. It may seem, like the ark, an useless or cumbersome contrivance, but when the clouds of oppression gather and break over the land and it is deluged with blood, then we shall perceive how admirable a refuge it yields from tyranny in legal forms.

There are three quarters from which forcible oppression may arise on so vast a scale as to need some special adaptation of the tribunals to be ready against the emergency. The violence may be that of a few powerful individuals, of an "anti-popular executive," or of the masses, and it will be well to devote a few words to the merits of jury trial as an institution designed to cope with these different evils.

The tyranny of one or more among a small but powerful band of subjects capable of bidding defiance to the legal Government, and overawing the ministers of justice, is one which in modern days we are little apt to consider. In fact, its interest is mainly

historical. Mr. Grote, in his able account of the dikasteries of Athens, draws special attention to this danger, as peculiarly necessitating large and popular tribunals. Within the narrow ambit of a Greek republic, as of any other State confined to the walls of a single city, it was easy for a private person, inheriting large means, occupying a strongly-fortified residence, and capable of enlisting a troop of hireling bravoës devoted to his fortunes, to acquire a strength that was fully a match for the small force which a State so limited could bring against him. It was to nip in the bud such dangerous growths that the arbitrary banishment by ostracism was introduced. In that fertile field of analogies to ancient Greece—the small republics which in the middle ages were scattered over the north of Italy—other contrivances, as Mr. Grote points out, were hit upon in order to meet this ever-present evil. Now from a single judge, it is argued, a verdict could never be expected against these powerful subjects. He was amenable to the influences of intimidation, of corruption, of party feeling. Himself probably belonging to the higher orders, his prejudices were enlisted against any punishment of offenders belonging to those orders for injuries inflicted on their meaner fellow-citizens. It was the plebeian Rienzi who hanged an Orsini, notorious for violence, profligacy, and murder, on the great staircase of the Lion at Rome, for the pillage of a wrecked vessel; a Colonna or an Orsini would have deemed it a disgrace to his own rank to sacrifice the life of a fellow-noble, whether friend or foe, to the justice that was invoked by an injured commoner. Nor, it is thought, would the single judge dare to make himself a mark for the vengeance of a powerful criminal by pronouncing against him the sentence of the law. Conspicuous by his position, he would be uttering his own doom if he sentenced to fine, imprisonment, or death, the leader of a hundred resolute and unscrupulous myrmidons. In proof that these are no mere conjectures, but that intimidation and corruption were able to subdue the uprightness of most judges, appeal is made to several of the Grecian cities where no such expedient as that of dikasteries was adopted. Only a large popular body, selected by lot, could be proof against respect for the criminal's exalted position, and inaccessible alike to the motives of hope and of fear.

To reason from this instance to that of even mediæval England, and from the security afforded by the dikastery to that presented by the jury, would, we apprehend, be in many respects delusive. No doubt, wherever the obstacle to the due administration of justice lies in a class with which the judge will have a sympathy, or against which the natural feelings of the people are a protection, it will be wise to entrust judicial functions to ordinary citizens. The principle of trial by peers may in such a case be

almost reversed ; it is not a tribunal of would-be oligarchs, but of free citizens that will save the State from the perils arising out of the power of a few. But to make a modern jury efficient for such a purpose, it might be necessary to augment its numbers to something like the extent of a dikastery. What profit would it be that the twelve were freely and impartially chosen, what profit that their good sense convinced them of the need to bring lawless wealth under the power of the law, if they were conscious that the eyes of retainers and spies were upon them—that a verdict against the offender would be the signal for a violent assault from the staves of a hundred bullies as soon as the jurors departed from the protection of the court? In a mediæval kingdom, we believe that the delegates of the Crown were far more capable of withstanding such intimidation than a few humble citizens could possibly be. Nor was it less the interest of the Crown and the constitutional officers than of the people to bend to the yoke of law the stubborn neck of the baronial tyranny that overshadowed alike cottage and throne. In early times it was to the Chancellor (fortified doubtless by his ecclesiastical character) that the weak and needy appealed against the wealthy oppressor, surrounded by obedient followers. Chancery was not the court of the rich, dreaded as a region where the way to the attainment of justice was "*longum iter, per ambages.*" The discoveries of the Record Commissioners

"show that for a long period after the jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery was fully established, it was chiefly occupied with affording relief against the tyranny and injustice of particular officers of position and power, or else against private persons of wealth and influence sufficient to defy the ordinary courts of justice and their ministers."\*

The petitions for its intervention were founded on complaints "that defendant is surrounded by many men of his maintenance," or, "is strong and abounding in riches, and a great maintainer of quarrels, and the complainant is poor, and hath not the means to sue for remedy at common law."

It is against the encroachments of a government desirous, under constitutional forms, of contracting or suppressing the liberty of the nation, that a jury, if freely appointed and acting freely, would be of the highest service. The judge, mingling familiarly with the governing body, and separated by high station and private sympathies from the mass of the people, has perhaps less motive than an unofficial citizen to exert a firm and determined resistance to the claims of a tyrannical power. He is moreover appointed by the Crown, and though, under the exist-

\* See notes of J. R. Redfield, LL.D., to Story's "Equity Jurisprudence" (9th edition), p. 36.

ing constitutional regulations, he is not removable at pleasure by the Crown, there would, in such days as we suppose, be not a little danger that, having earned his post by the engagement to pander to the schemes of royal tyranny, he should afterwards exert himself to earn on the bench the wages he was already receiving. His appointment might indeed be determined as much by the servility as by the learning of the candidates available for the vacant office. We know with how powerful an effect, in the old evil times of parliamentary corruption, the private influence of the sovereign or the minister was exerted on the statesmen who held the scale in their hands. Many a politician whom shame would have held back from yielding more publicly to the royal favours, sold himself unblushingly when closeted with Henry Fox or Newcastle. Even the pure-handed Chatham, in the strange admixture of weakness that marred his lofty character, was impotent to resist his sovereign's appeals to his feelings of loyalty, wept with thankfulness to find that the faithful discharge of his duty had not alienated the king's favour, and finally worked the overthrow of his most cherished principles and schemes—that he might be no longer bowed down beneath the “insupportable load” of royal displeasure! His was indeed an extreme instance of what loyalty could effect when pitted against principle; but have we any guarantee that solicitation or browbeating might not in future times be brought to bear with telling effect by the sovereign on the isolated judge?

The judge, as we have said, would probably share largely the feelings of the upper classes among whom he moved, and to whose position his own was assimilated. But the suspicions or the hostility there entertained respecting the people at large, would not be found in the citizens from whom the jury-box was supplied. They would be on their own defence, and whatever the merits or defects of their verdict, it would at least be untainted with any unpatriotic prejudice. It would be so, we say, provided the jury was appointed fairly and acting freely—but this proviso is all-important. If subject to the old law that punished by fine or imprisonment any verdict contrary to the evidence—that is, which was pronounced to be so by a judge, or by the Privy Council—it would need much rashness, or much heroism, on their part to do anything more than mirror the decision of the bench. As was said of some king's evidence, buying pardon by perjury in the most infamous State-trials, they would be fishing like cormorants with ropes round their necks. From this risk the honest juror is now free. But there is another risk from which we are not everywhere free. Where the Crown, as is the case in most parts of the country, selects the sheriff from among the nominees of

the judges and principal State officers, and the sheriff selects from the jurors' list the names to be placed on the panel; we are still open to the danger of the verdict being merely the second or third edition of the fiat of the Crown. If the sovereign cannot bribe or intimidate the juror, he may thus influence the sheriff who selects the juror. Wherever he has this power, the days of corrupt judges would be the days of packed jurors.

And history tells the same tale. The days of corrupt judges *were* the days of packed jurors. Let us look back to the darkest days in the annals of English law—the days when the later Stuarts, banishing from the bench every name that was not conspicuous for corruption, filled up the ranks with the Jeffreyses, the Wrights, and the Sawyers :

“ When infamous Venality, grown bold,  
Wrote on his bosom, ‘ To be let or sold : ’ ”

when all reluctant instruments of oppression, unable to keep pace with the growing violence of monarchy, were systematically swept away, and replaced by knaves with tongues of iron and foreheads of brass, till the supply of judges began to run short lest there should be no ability, or no villany, left to furnish the Crown-lawyers. Then, if ever, there was need that the jury system should offer to the honest peaceable citizens a barrier against the tyranny of the throne. But Charles and James well understood the wisdom of laying the axe at the root of the tree, and instead of attempting to bribe juries, rather secured juries that would need no bribing. It was with this view that, on frivolous pretexts, London and the other corporations which enjoyed the right of electing their own sheriffs were deprived of their charters, and the nominors of the juries thus rendered the nominees of the crown. Thus was the jury procured that hanged Cornish, an honest and peaceful citizen, but wealthy and no friend to arbitrary government, before the doors of his house in Cheapside. Thus the Whig faction, for some time masters of the city of London, was completely cowed, and the monarchs were enabled to proceed undisturbed in their attack on the civil rights and religious freedom of the people. At last the tide turned, and Westminster Hall rang with shouts of joy at the acquittal of the Seven Bishops; but the day when the popular feeling could be no longer excluded from the jury-box did not arrive till the same feeling had also risen to so threatening a height that the unjust judge quailed before the national wrath, and trembled on the bench “ as though all the peers present had halters in their pockets.”

At a later date, when the terrors excited by the French Revolution and its English admirers drove the ruling classes into arbitrary Acts of Parliament, into the suppression of free discus-



sion, into restraints on public meetings, and into suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, there were some differences in the scene. The sheriffs of London were then, as in common with those of many other important cities and towns they are now, elected chiefly by the citizens. The juries whom they returned were probably a fair representation of the general voice of the middle classes, and are eulogized by high authorities as having, in fact, saved the country by their steadfast refusal to return verdicts of guilty on the weak evidence offered by the agents of Government. Before the juries of London were held some of the chief State-trials of the time. In vain did the Government call on them to condemn the bookseller Eaton, for selling the pamphlets of Thomas Paine; or Walker of Manchester, for taking up arms against the king, when his sole offence had been the protection of his house against a mob; or Thomas Hardy, Horne Tooke, and Thelwall, charged with conspiring against the king, and proved guilty of little more than advocating extravagant schemes of representation, and issuing a prospectus for a convention incompatible with the authority of Parliament. The gratitude of posterity is due to those jurors who firmly refused to be seduced by the sophistry of Sir John Scott, the Attorney General, or minister in any way to the aggressive spirit of Loughborough the Chancellor, or Kenyon the Chief Justice. Their upright opposition illustrates the statement we have already made, and which indeed is the plainest dictate of common sense, that in a contest under legal forms between an encroaching government and a free people, a jury freely and fairly selected will present a valuable barrier against the destruction of their own liberties. In all its attacks the Government of that day was not equally unsuccessful; but its victories were mainly confined to the rural districts, where the tenants and tradesmen in the box were the dependents of the justices, and to cases where the culprits and the subjects in dispute were of a more trifling character. The attorney who for an idle exclamation that he was for equality and no king, found himself pilloried, imprisoned, and struck off the rolls; the two prisoners who, for a *jeu d'esprit* publicly posted on the walls, were found guilty of a conspiracy to break prison, could bear evidence that the jury placed no insuperable bar in the way of governmental tyranny. Such isolated evils would no doubt recur with the recurrence of these purposes in a modern government; but if the chief cities, the scenes of the most powerful agitation and joint action on the popular side, retained their present control over the appointment of their sheriffs, there is reason to believe that the jury system would be our reliable safeguard against an organized attack on liberty.

But what shall we say of the tyranny of the masses—the evil with which modern society is more conspicuously threatened? The insolence of the wealthy few, the unconstitutional claims of the Crown, have little but a speculative or historical interest; the day when they menaced liberty is past, and to guard against them is truly to lock the stable door when the steed has been stolen. No one looks forward to a time when an earl will bring down a body of retainers or braves to overawe a tribunal, or a high-handed monarch act upon the dogma of divine right. But the peril against which modern society has really to guard arises from the extortionate claims of the lower classes—the numerical majority with insufficient education, unreasonable hostility to those in the enjoyment of large fortunes, and intolerance of the thoughtful and philanthropic who preach unpalatable truth. It is also, and perhaps more directly, menaced by the tendency on the part of a class rather higher than the workman's to enforce a servile obedience to its wishes and ways of thinking on dissident members of itself, and on those whose superior education entitles them to the position of leaders rather than followers of custom. Should these feelings gain ground, and become the staple of future politics, will that be the wisest organization of our tribunals which throws the decision into the hands of the multitude, and enthrones popular prejudice on the judgment-seat? The same circumstances which render jury trial a security against unpopular oppression, render it also a tool in the hands of popular. Apart from its liability, as in other cases, to be tampered with or packed, it will, even if left to its own impulses, when the offences it has to try are dictated by a spirit shared in by the class from which it is drawn, bring to the box the prejudices of that class and look with leniency on its transgressions.

We have alluded to the popular election of sheriffs as an obstacle to the tyranny of the Crown. But it is well to remark that in the evil days when Whig and Tory shed each other's blood like water, the office of sheriff was an object of the intensest competition to the hostile factions. Macaulay tells us how, in London, the chiefs of either side, nobles though they might be, did not think it beneath them to share in the processions on nomination day, and support their partisans, and how they awaited in their mansions, in breathless eagerness, the result of the elections. A Tory sheriff meant that every jury impanelled during the year on a political charge would acquit the Tory; a Whig sheriff meant *carte blanche* for Shaftesbury and Buckingham in the wildest excesses of Whiggery. In many of the disgraceful trials of Charles II.'s reign, the injustice of the jury was the result of no secret influence or packing—it was but the spirit dominant throughout the people. Romanist after Romanist,

of upright life and innocent of political schemes, was sent to the gallows on the evidence of eavesdroppers and debauchees, during the frenzy that seized on the nation in consequence of the revelations of Oates. The same mistrust of all Papists—the same strong excitement which is the parent of fear, itself the parent of cruelty—that pervaded hosts of worthy and respectable citizens, and led the spectators to applaud the condemnation and hiss the sufferers in their last agony, carried away the jury as it did all their neighbours. On the other hand when, in the United States, the editors of an Abolitionist journal were some years ago attacked by the mob, one killed and the rest left for dead, it was in vain to seek conviction for so gross an outrage from jurors impregnated, like the offenders, with hatred and contempt for the negro. So in the disorderly districts of Ireland, it has been found necessary to dispense, or at least to make provision for dispensing with, jury trial, the criminal at the bar being in his passions and antipathies a type of his neighbours, by whom he would ordinarily have been tried. In Western Australia the jury system prevailed at a time when almost the whole of the inhabitants were convicts from the United Kingdom; and Sir Charles Dilke tells us that a criminal indicted before a jury of such persons had so little occasion for uneasiness that they would hand down a paper to his counsel to save him the trouble of exerting himself, as they meant to acquit the prisoner.

What sort of name, we wonder, would jury trial have had in England if our first knowledge of it had been gained from its use in the French Revolution? It was then the mouthpiece of a people whom heartless tyranny and cold neglect, famine and penury, and the intoxication of sudden power had thrown into frightful madness. In the Revolutionary Tribunal, first established in 1792, to avenge the “patriots” slain on the 10th of August, the jury, like the officials, were originally elected by the people. This tribunal, suppressed after the massacres of September as being too dilatory, was revived in March, 1793, with judge and jury appointed by the Convention, and was thenceforth the chief instrument employed in the numerous trials of the Republic. No room for the complaint of the French lawyer Merlin, touching the excessive mercy commonly displayed alike by French and English juries; no room for his absurd boast that “it has not yet been proved that they have ever shed a drop of innocent blood.” It is true that a bare majority was sufficient to dispose of a life—that an edict of 1793 allowed them, after spending three days on a trial, to pronounce their verdict as soon as their minds were made up; and that all forms which could check the demonstrativeness of spectators, or insure the patient hearing of a defence, all qualifications of property or education

for the discharge of so responsible a task were swept away in the nation's tempestuous wrath. But even so, have we not in the contemplation of their work a fearful sarcasm on our indiscriminate eulogies on this institution as though it were the infallible safeguard of the accused? forgetting that the jury of democrats trying the alleged aristocrat is but, in the words of Dickens, "a jury of dogs impanelled to try the deer." Before this body were arraigned, and from it were hurried to execution, the most illustrious and exalted among the popular leaders—the members of the Gironde, Vergniaud, Brissot, Guadet, who had been eager to obtain justice for the atrocious prison massacres, and had pleaded the cause of the innocent king against the sanguinary declamations of Robespierre. There, the accomplished and heroic wife of Roland was condemned on her refusal to betray her husband's retreat. There, General Custine was sentenced on an unsupported charge of treacherous conspiracy with the foes of the Republic. There, the hapless queen encountered the brutal insults of accuser and juror. There it was sufficient cause of condemnation that one had been an architect in the service of the Court, or that another was a priest, though he had not declined the constitutional oath, or that a young country girl had presented a bouquet to the King of Prussia on his entrance into her town. Not even in humility of station was there security against unfounded accusation and indiscriminate sentence, and the passions originally kindled against noble and priest were finally glutted with the lives of petty shopkeepers, seamstresses, and artisans.

We have no wish to press too far the arguments drawn from those awful and notorious events of which we should have said, before the occurrences of last May, that we need never fear to see their parallel but in a society as foully and monstrously corrupt as the despotism they supplanted. But we allude to them as an illustration of the absurdity of expecting protection against all possible tyranny from a tribunal composed of ordinary citizens, as able, and, at the present day, as likely as any special class to impose on others a conformity with their objects and a subserviency to their supposed interests—to look with a hostile eye on the statesman who denounces their policy and exposes their vices, on the workman who refuses to bend to the rules of his craft, on the idiosyncrasies of the rebel against the authority of Grundyism; while they wink at offences which are the outcome of a spirit they approve. We shall scarcely render our law courts a secure stronghold against a formidable army by installing a regiment of that army as a garrison.

Neither for suitability to ordinary nor to political occurrences does trial by jury merit the panegyrics commonly lavished upon

it. Incompetent for the former, it is no valid protection against the most menacing evils attendant on the latter. It is time that the public mind should be more awake to its many deficiencies, and to the greater claims on their confidence of a trained judge, superior alike in experience, in the responsibility of his position, and in freedom from popular prejudice. To these qualifications the confidence of the people would add one now wanting, and would ripen the views confined to a small minority into the established creed of the nation. Such changes as we have spoken of will be in accordance with that respect for education and intelligence which is indispensably required if the increasing power of the masses is to be indeed a blessing.

---

## ART. II.—THE POLITICAL RECONSTRUCTION OF GERMANY.

1. *Die Verfassung des deutschen Reiches mit der Verfassung des Norddeutschen Bundes zusammengestellt.* Von Dr. STOCKMANN. Leipzig. 1871.
2. *Die Verfassung des deutschen Reiches in den Grundzügen und Verhältnissen zu den Einzelstaaten.* Von LORENZ HAUSER. Nördlingen. 1871.
3. *Das neue deutsche Reich und seine Verfassung.* Von Dr. LEOPOLD AUERBACH. Berlin. 1871.
4. *L'Allemagne politique depuis la paix de Prague.* VICTOR CHERBULIEZ. Paris. 1780.

**I**T is proposed in the following essay to consider three questions connected with German politics. The first is, To what causes is the late political development of the German nation due? The second is, What are the main features which distinguish the recent work of political reconstruction, as exhibited in the constitutions of 1867 and 1870? The third is, What is the ultimate form of government which the German nation is destined to adopt? The first of these questions falls within the domain of pure history; the second is a question to be determined by what may be called comparative politics; the third must be answered by an hypothesis based on the data collected and on a review of the present state of political parties.

It is the fashion among philosophers of a certain school to explain divergencies of national or individual character by assuming innate tendencies inherent in the race or the individual. Many have sought to explain the political backwardness of the German race by a supposition of this sort. It has long been a

favourite theory with French writers that the German character is essentially dreamy and metaphysical, lacking the practical vigour necessary for success in politics. It may be considered enough to point to the events of the last year in disproof of such statements. But setting aside the logic of facts, we may condemn the supposition as gratuitous and irrational. No doubt it is often the case that owing to some cause or other the political development of a nation is retarded. In such cases the nation's talented men will be more inclined to devote themselves to such subjects as literature and metaphysics. But such a diversion of the country's intelligence is both unnatural and deplorable. The work to which every community of men is first called and best fitted, is that of self-organization and self-government. To credit a great nation with inaptitude for this work is an absurdity, to encourage the delusion is a crime.

Other writers, reading the history of the present through the spectacles of the past, ascribe the political divisions of modern Germany to the deep-rooted love of autonomy characteristic of all the Teutonic stocks. Reference is made to Tacitus's account of Germany, and the facts of recent history are held to be sufficiently explained by the pre-political habits of Arminius and his contemporaries. Such theories, noticed here rather because of their prevalence than of their philosophical value, may be dismissed with a few remarks. It may safely be assumed that the same qualities which serve to hold together a savage tribe will serve also to hold together a civilized nation. Tribal cohesion is but an inchoate form of political cohesion; nor can the unity, confessedly necessary to the tribe, be dispensed with by a larger community. The nation, with its homogeneous institutions, based on common blood language and literature, is the political unit of our civilization. It may be true that these units are destined to be absorbed hereafter in still larger political aggregations. But national unity is a step by which alone such progress is made possible. Confederation, as understood by the Germans of the last century, was not an alternative system of government, but a sign of retarded development—not a rival construction, but an imperfection.

Turning from these futile hypotheses to the region of sober history, we notice one important distinction between Germany and the nations by which she was surrounded. On Germany fell the mantle of imperial Rome. It was a German monarch who inherited the name of Cæsar and the traditions of universal sovereignty associated with it. The Holy Roman Empire, being as it was rather the shadow of a past fact than the expression of an actual want or the embodiment of a living idea, interfered with the natural course of events, and prevented the

growth of the ordinary monarchies, which sprung up in the rest of Europe out of the ruins of feudalism. It is essential, however, to bear in mind that the legend of the empire was no native product of German habits of thought, but rather the common legacy of the imperial city to all the countries which formerly obeyed her sway. It held ground in Germany longer than elsewhere, because the national spirit necessary to counteract it was weaker there than elsewhere. The German Empire of the middle ages must be regarded therefore rather as a secondary than a primary cause of the long political failure of the continental Teutons.

One further historical cause remains to be noticed. Germany was the home and centre of the great religious movement of the sixteenth century. Her energies were long absorbed by religious controversies and religious wars, and the political life of the people doubtless suffered from the fact. An eminent French writer has remarked that a nation which is the author of a universal work of which the world reaps the fruits, such, for instance, as the Christian religion, the Renaissance, the Reformation, the French Revolution, atones for its greatness before the world by centuries of humiliation and national death. According to this writer the conditions of healthy national life are narrow and limited, demanding the exercise of common sense rather than of inspiration, of mediocrity rather than of genius. Thus the Hebrews, the Italians, the Germans, and French failed politically at the time in which their influence on the world was most felt. There is truth in the remark, but not in the sneer implied in it. No doubt all great human movements, be they political, social, or religious, tend to specialize themselves in proportion to their intensity. But where such specialization has the effect of stunting other elements of a nation's life, it must be condemned as an exaggeration, not praised as an excellence. The tendency to caricature, to develop a part at the expense of the whole, is observable here as elsewhere in the current theories of our century.

But a physical cause, yet more potent and more constant in operation than any mere historical cause, has affected profoundly the destinies of Germany. The German race has suffered incalculably from the dispersion of its various stocks and the indefiniteness of its frontier. It may be said that the disposition of a nation to political consolidation is, *cæteris paribus*, proportioned directly to the definiteness of its natural boundaries. The small compass and fixed maritime boundaries of England gave her an advantage in this respect of which she was not slow to avail herself. France, bounded North West and South by the Channel the Bay of Biscay and the Pyrenees, was the next to form herself into a

compact nationality. Italy, from a geographical point of view more fortunate than France, was only distanced in the race through the disturbing influences of the Papacy and the shadow of imperial Rome. A nation which has inherited the glorious traditions of a history not properly its own, will always find greater difficulty in adapting itself to new conditions of national development. That she has succeeded in overcoming these historical hindrances must be ascribed in a large degree to the advantages entailed by her position. Germany, on the other hand, possessing no sufficient frontier East West or South, with branches of her stock settled beyond the Rhine in Alsace and Lorraine, beyond the Carpathians in Siebenbürgen, far into the Alps in Switzerland and Tyrol, was weighted in the race at the very outset. Hindered already by her territorial position, she encumbered herself still further by importing the legend of the empire from Rome. The religious revolution, which originated with her, only widened her divisions and carried her still farther from the desired unity. Thus it came to pass that a certain fixed character, a love of abstract speculation, and an inaptitude for politics were long regarded as peculiar attributes of the German race.

Such were some of the simpler causes to which the political backwardness of the German people is mainly due. The events which mark the steps by which these difficulties were overcome—the meeting of the Frankfort Diet in 1848, the coalitions under the respective leadership of Prussia and Austria, the Danish war, the struggle for the hegemony of Germany which ended at Sadowa—are all fresh in the recollection of living men, and it would be beyond the scope of this essay to give a detailed account of them. We therefore pass on to the second division of our subject, and proceed to examine the constitution of 1867.

What was the aim of the great statesman who accomplished the work? What were the materials on which he had to work? What were the main difficulties with which he had to contend? The aim of the statesman was to transform a number of confederated States into a single federal State; or, to use the German words current at the time, to convert a "*Staatenbund*" into a "*Bundesstaat*." In what respects does the federal State, or *Bundesstaat*, differ from the confederation of States, or *Staatenbund*? The federal State was first brought into existence by America, and its nature was first formulated by De Tocqueville in the famous definition "*Une forme de société dans laquelle plusieurs peuples se fondent réellement en un seul quant à certains intérêts communs, et restent séparés pour tous les autres.*" The objection to this definition is that, though marking admirably the distinction between a federal and a centralized or national



State, it fails to mark the still more subtle distinction between a federal State and a confederation of States. The distinction to be drawn lies herein, that the federal State alone possesses a central authority which acts directly on the citizen *without the intervention of the minor governments*. Such a central authority Count Bismarck set himself to provide for the States of North Germany. It was to be distinct from the central authority in a fully centralized State, such as France or England, only in the sphere of its competence. Within this sphere it was to be supreme over the local governments alike in legislation and administration.

The establishment of an authority of this sort being the object of the legislator of 1867, we next ask, What were the materials on which he had to work? How did the problem, as presented to him, differ from the problem as presented to the statesmen who constructed the constitution of the United States? The difference was this—Washington and his successors had to deal with a group of republics, Bismarck had to deal with a group of monarchies. Now it requires very little reflection to perceive that the application of the federal principle to a group of monarchies is by very much the harder task. Republican government lends itself to political transformation much more easily than monarchical government. For instance, a central assembly composed of members chosen by the several republican States can fairly claim to represent the collective interests of the united States. There need be no respect shown for persons; the comparative importance of each State can be allowed for by a fair apportionment of the votes. In the same way, a president or an executive board, chosen either by such an assembly or directly by the people themselves, may lay claim to impartiality, and govern in the name of the whole people. But a group of monarchies lacks altogether this element of elasticity. Here the factors of government are fixed, not changeable, and lend themselves very unready to any such manipulation. The monarch of a federated State finds himself placed in this dilemma. Either he must accept a seat in the legislative assembly of the federal government, or he must remain in the background and nominate a representative. By adopting the first course he subjects himself to a rude contest of wits for which he is probably unfitted; by adopting the second, he runs the risk of having his personality and influence entirely ignored. In the formation of a federal executive the difficulties are still more serious. Here it is absolutely necessary that some chief or president be chosen; for a single head to direct the administration is as indispensable as a plurality of advisers. To fill this position, either one of the

monarchs must be chosen, or one of their subjects must be put over the heads of them all. The objection to the first alternative is that each monarch necessarily represents certain special interests, not the interests of the whole. The adoption of the second would be equivalent to an abandonment of the monarchical principle.

We next ask what was the machinery by means of which Count Bismarck proposed to overcome these difficulties, and how far did he succeed in overcoming them. With the peculiar obstinacy which characterizes most successful statesmen, the Count set one limited object before himself and made everything subserve to the attainment of that object. He saw that the political reconstruction of Germany was impossible until his country was in a position to deny effectively the right of interfering with German politics assumed by France. In other words, he saw that military and diplomatic must precede purely political reconstruction. A central authority invested with entire control over the army and the diplomatic service were the two things needful. To gain unity in these departments he sacrificed unity of legislation and of home administration.

In whose hands was the central military and diplomatic authority to be placed? There was in fact little choice in the matter. It could not be entrusted to the people, for the double reason that the separate governments would not have permitted it, and that the people were incapable of wielding a power which they had not yet learned to use. It could not be entrusted to a council nominated by the governments, because such a council would have been too much bound by the traditions of the old Staaten-Bund to serve as an effective instrument for the new policy of the Bundesstaat. It could not be entrusted to a president chosen either by the people or by the Federal Council, because such a president could not have existed by the side of the several existing monarchs without either eclipsing them or being eclipsed by them. It only remained to entrust this central power to the monarch of the leading State. This was what was actually done. Count Bismarck's leading thought, the necessity of arming the new State against possible foreign aggression, found expression in Article 11 of the new constitution, which is really the key to the whole scheme. This article places unconditionally in the hands of the King of Prussia the power of declaring war, of making treaties, of receiving and accrediting ambassadors, while Article 63 secures to him the sole administration of the army. The consent of the Bundesrath is only required in financial treaties affecting the home, not the foreign, policy of the State. And not only is the entire "force matérielle"

of the State placed in the King's hands, but also the money necessary for maintaining it.\* Each State was bound to furnish a contingent to the common army in the proportion of one per cent. to its entire population, and to contribute 225 thalers per annum for the maintenance of each soldier. This provision was withdrawn from the control both of Parliament and Federal Council, being made fixed and unalterable till the date December 31st, 1871. To prevent any evasion, the very taxes available for the support of the army and other common burdens were specified.† Nay more, the very power of deliberation on military matters was put under the control of the president, the members of the Bundesrath Committee chosen for that purpose, unlike those of the remaining committees, being nominated by him, while for foreign affairs no such committee was tolerated.‡ It follows from these provisions that there were no responsible ministers either for war or for foreign affairs. These two ministers were, properly speaking, mere royal officials, not ministers. No doubt in the case of Count Bismarck the *de jure* relations of king and servant were *de facto* reversed. The king was probably rather the *Deus ex machinâ* who endorsed, than the guiding spirit who initiated, the foreign policy of the State. But this result was due to the personal ascendancy of the Count, being contrary to the provisions of the constitution. Again, as the Chancellor had *ex-officio* a seat in the Reichstag, he was naturally often forced to offer explanations as to the foreign policy of the government, but the Reichstag had no legal power of controlling him.

Thus the military and diplomatic departments—the material as well as the moral instrument by which one State maintains its rights and upholds its dignity against another State—were entrusted to the control of the King of Prussia. No doubt this is absolutism in a certain sense, but it is not necessarily despotism. It is absolute power, but it can be wielded only against the public enemy, not against the citizen. The prerogative of the president in all internal questions was subjected to important restrictions. Military "execution" against a refractory member of the Bund could not be ordered, certain peculiar cases excepted, but by a resolution of the Bundesrath. In the same way commercial treaties required the authorization of that body. Although we may not altogether approve so complete a surrender of popular prerogative in matters of foreign policy, it may be questioned whether the English system does not run into the opposite extreme; whether, for instance, a modification of the

---

\* Cf. Arts. 60 and 62 of North German Constitution.

† Art. 35.

‡ Art. 8.

Austrian system, which makes the three Imperial ministers independent of the ordinary party changes of government, and renders them responsible to a committee chosen from the two parliaments, might not be adopted with advantage to the solidarity and dignity of our foreign policy.\*

The problem of a central legislature was only partially solved. No single person or body of persons was declared sovereign. A system of checks was devised similar to that existing in America, and supposed to exist in England. As in those countries, three "organs of government" are recognised—the President, the Bundesrath or Federal Council, and the Reichstag or popular House. But power is divided very unequally between them. The veto of the president, nominally allowed in England and actually allowed in America, holds good only in certain special cases in Germany.† This restriction of his prerogative in legislation is no doubt a set-off against the extraordinary powers with which he is vested in the military and foreign departments. On the other hand, the Bundesrath, or organ of the separate minor governments, is loaded with privileges.‡ The constitution of this council is particularly deserving of notice. In the first place through it, as in the case of the American Senate, exceptional power is given to minorities. To use De Tocqueville's words, it represents the principle of federation as opposed to the principle of population. Through it the personality of the single federated States is recognised as distinguished from the will of the majority. The votes commanded by the minor States very much exceed the number to which their size and importance entitle them. In the second place, the Bundesrath does not properly represent the will of the separate States, but the will of the separate governments. No doubt in most of the States some sort of constitutional government has been established, and in these cases the will of the people has an indirect influence on the different courts and ministries. But the caprice of the ruling monarch is still an important element, affecting the decisions of these petty councils. It will be seen from this account that the Bundesrath was opposed in its very essence to the main scheme of the new

---

\* *i.e.*, the Chancellor, who is Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of War, and the Minister of Imperial Finance, who are responsible to the two "Delegations" chosen from the Austrian Reichsrath and the Hungarian Reichstag.

† He could veto (1) legislative measures affecting the existing military and naval arrangements; (2) administrative enactments of the Bundesrath disturbing existing arrangements with regard to the levy of the federal duties.

‡ Thus the Bundesrath might be summoned without the Reichstag, not the Reichstag without the Bundesrath (Art. 12). Every member of the Bundesrath had the right to appear and make proposals in the Reichstag (Art. 9). Again, the Bundesrath met in secret, no report was issued of its proceedings, so that public opinion had no control over them.

constitution. In recognising it, Count Bismarck made a concession to the spirit of separatism. This was the price he paid for the centralization which he succeeded in establishing in the other departments. The monarchical character of the federated States could not be ignored. Count Bismarck chose the least objectionable course in giving the various petty monarchs an undue share in the conduct of legislation. A way of escape was, however, provided. In recognition of the transitional nature of many of the arrangements, no exceptional difficulties were thrown in the way of constitutional modifications. A simple majority of the Reichstag, or popular House, and not a majority of two-thirds, as in most cases, was declared sufficient, with the consent of the Bundesrath, to justify an alteration of the constitution.

We now turn to the most complex question of all—viz., the nature and constitution of the executive government established by the Confederation. There are three main existing types of government which may be called respectively the mediæval, the English, and the American type. According to the first, government is conducted by a set of officials nominated by a hereditary monarch; according to the second, by a board elected from, and in constant contact with, the two Houses of Parliament; according to the third, by a president elected directly by the people, and acting independently of the legislature. Did the constitution of 1867 add another to these three existing types of government, or did it merely mark a transition from the mediæval to the English or American type, and if so, to which of the two? Like all political works meant for use and not for show, the constitution of 1867 was essentially a patchwork, a rearrangement of existing materials with the help of foreign models. There are bits of mediæval work to be traced in it, bits of English work, bits of American work.

In the first place, it recognises a hereditary president vested alike with the pomp of an English monarch and the power of an American president. In the second place, it recognises a prime minister, nominated however, literally not only nominally, by the president. This minister has no subordinate ministers to serve under him, and is alone responsible to the popular House for all the acts of the government. What was the object of this peculiar arrangement? Here again we see a concession made to the petty governments. It was thought advisable to give them at least an apparent share in the home administration. For this purpose it was provided that certain committees, each consisting of four persons, should be appointed by the Bundesrath to manage the different home departments. These committees possessed no direct executive power, nor were they responsible for their decisions to the popular House. The executive power was in

each case placed in the hands of an official nominated by the president, for whose actions the prime minister alone was responsible. The committees therefore can have had little more than the right of proposing, the right of disposing being left in other hands. The compromise adopted by Count Bismarck was no doubt ingenious. If he had made these committees responsible, they would probably in time have acquired real power. If he had converted the heads of the different departments into responsible ministers, he would have wounded the susceptibilities of the members of the Bundesrath, and possibly have created an open rupture. By the method adopted, the Bundesrath acquired certain quasi-executive functions, which conferred dignity even if they failed to confer much real power.

One further question remains to be asked. What control did the Reichstag, or popular House, exercise over the executive? As has been shown, the ordinary military budget was removed till December 31st, 1871, entirely from their control. When we consider that by far the greater part of the common expenses was incurred for the maintenance of the army and navy, there existing as yet no common debt, no civil list, and only a very limited number of federal officials, we can understand how thoroughly powerless they were to oppose the designs of the president and his chief minister.\* Their privileges on this head may be summed up as follows. First, they had a certain control over Count Bismarck in his capacity as home administrator. Of this privilege they made but slight use, as the perusal of any important debate will testify. Secondly, they could refuse to vote the supplies for the payment of the federal officials and other minor items of expenditure. Thirdly, they could refuse to vote the extra supplies for the army demanded from time to time by the government. Within these limits the executive government was left independent of them.

To an Englishman who has mastered these details there seems a sort of latent irony in the clauses of the constitution which refer to the Reichstag. He finds that according to Article 20, its members are to be elected triennially, by ballot, and from universal suffrage. There follow a number of provisions guaranteeing them freedom of discussion, the right of initiative in legislation, the right of sending up popular petitions to the

---

\* The expenditure for the year 1871 was as follows :—

	Thalers.		Thalers.
Army . . . . .	86,214,288	Consulships . . . . .	354,350
Navy . . . . .	3,596,730	Account Office . . . . .	63,000
Bundesrath, &c. . . . .	274,450	Commercial Court of Appeal . . . . .	58,600
Reichstag . . . . .	20,563	Debt . . . . .	612,000
Foreign Office . . . . .	885,530		

Bundesrath, &c. No doubt it would be easy to lavish criticism of the sort affected by some French writers on a constitution which conceded so little to the popular voice. A Parliament endowed with such scanty privileges would probably anywhere else but in Germany have forgotten its possible future, and have contracted the vices which generally result from the absence of responsibility. But the German Parliament never lost sight of its dignity, nor degenerated into a body of idle talkers. Whether Count Bismarck was right or not in limiting their privileges so closely, is a question which admits of difference of opinion. But before forming a conclusion on this point, let it be borne in mind that an infinite series of ciphers will not produce a unit, and in the same way that twenty-two semi-absolute duchies, princedoms, and kingdoms cannot be converted by a stroke of the pen into a republic or even a constitutional monarchy.\*

Apart from the actual share borne by it in the government of the Confederation, the Reichstag had a really important sphere for its activity. The constitution of 1867 was in many ways a mere skeleton left for the labour of future legislators to complete and fill up. It was reserved for the Reichstag to draw up the series of great measures required to give shape and substance to the shadowy conception of German unity. It only needs to glance at the list of important laws which passed through the House between 1867-71,† to appreciate the extent of its labours in this direction. For in spite of the clauses noticed above which conferred a number of peculiar privileges on the other branch of the legislature, the intrinsic superiority of the Reichstag for legislative purposes could not fail in the long run to assert itself. It is then mainly to the credit of this body that the later legislation of the Bund must be assigned.

We now turn to the constitution of 1870. This constitution, while reproducing the main features of its predecessor, introduced a number of important modifications which will be noticed in detail. In the first place the mere addition of four new States with fifteen new votes to the Bund effected a material alteration in the balance of power. The voice of the president, which formerly commanded seventeen out of forty-three votes in the Bundesrath, that is to say, not much less than half, now com-

---

\* This view is curiously illustrated by a remarkable statement of Dr. Auerbach's in the treatise quoted at the head of this review. "The national assembly has that share in the central power which alone can be accorded to it in a constitutional state—viz., a share in the legislation." Dr. Auerbach has evidently not grasped the method of election, &c., peculiar to the English executive.

† These laws are appended to the constitution of the new German empire, to which they form, according to the provision of Art. 79, a supplement.

mands only seventeen out of fifty-eight, that is to say, distinctly less than a third. A glance at the census will show how utterly these numbers fail to represent the real relations of power. The population of Prussia amounts to twenty-four millions, that of the remaining States to fourteen millions. A strict distributive justice would therefore apportion to the former State thirty-six out of the fifty-eight votes, that is to say, more than double the number of votes which she actually possesses. The complaints raised by some of the minor States as to the unfair division of power, really seem, in the face of this fact, a little misplaced.

The formal alterations made by the constitution of 1870 tend almost uniformly in one direction. They weaken the central power of the Bund and augment its purely federative character. It was noticed in the above sketch that the least centralized part of the North German constitution was the part referring to the legislature. Here not only was the will of the dissentient atoms recognised by the side of the will of the mass, but the council which represented these atomic wills received exceptional privileges as compared with the body which represented the will of the whole people. Two attempts, however, were made to centralize the legislative power, the first recognising the president's right of veto in military and naval questions; the second, opening a door to centralizing reforms by the facilities offered to alterations of the constitution. In the new constitution the president's right of veto received a certain very slight extension. The veto in financial questions, which was confined in 1857 to such administrative enactments of the Bundesrath as tended to disturb existing arrangements with regard to the levy of the federal duties, is extended generally to legislation on the same subject.\* But the facilities offered for constitutional alterations have been altogether swept away. In 1867 a majority of two-thirds of the Bundesrath was sufficient to authorize a change of this nature, now a minority of fourteen can prevent any change, or in other words, a majority of more than three-quarters is declared necessary to secure it. The number fourteen was chosen in compliance with the demands of Bavaria; its significance is obvious.† The three most powerful of the minor States, Bavaria, Saxony, and Wurtemberg, possess together exactly this number of votes. Opportunity is therefore given to these three States to form a sort of permanent opposition to all constitutional reform. But Articles 7 and 28 introduce a still more questionable modification. It is there provided that where a question is raised, whether in the Bundesrath or in the Reichstag, affecting the interests of only a part of the Bund, only

---

\* Art. 5 of new Constitution, compared with Art. 37 of old Constitution.

† Art. 78 of Constitution of German Empire.



the voices of the representatives of the States affected shall be counted in the division. This clause strikes at the root of the very principle of a Bundesstaat, and throws a terrible obstacle in the way of the political reconstruction of Germany.

The Bundesrath is also invested with a sort of probouleutic power, similar to that possessed by the Athenian Boule in the time of Pericles. It has the privilege of drawing up and forming resolutions on the different measures to be laid before the Reichstag during the Session.\* It is not expressly stated that all bills laid before the Lower House must be subjected to this preliminary examination on the part of the council. Such a provision would amount to a denial of the former's right of initiative in legislation. It is probably only meant that the Government, as opposed to the private bills, must be introduced first into the Bundesrath. It will be remembered that the prime minister's freedom of action was similarly restricted by Article 16 of the old constitution. But the new constitution gives much greater prominence to this necessity of co-operation on the part of the Bundesrath, asserting it in the list of constitutional prerogatives attaching to that body. Thus the legislative action of the government is permanently hampered by the control of the organs of the several minor States.

The central executive power was attacked still more directly. The North German constitution granted to the president the privilege of declaring war in the name of the Bund; the German constitution obliges him to obtain the prior consent of the Bundesrath, except in the case that a foreign enemy has made an actual attack on the territory of the Bund.† Again, the president had the power of ordering "execution" against a State which neglected to furnish its military contingent in cases where danger would be incurred by delay. This limited right of independent action is removed by the new constitution. "Execution" can in no case be ordered except by the resolution of the Bundesrath.‡

Again, the president had the sole control of the diplomatic department, no committee being appointed for this purpose. The new constitution provides for the construction of a permanent committee of the Bundesrath for foreign affairs, which is to consist alone of the representatives of Bavaria, Saxony, and Wurtemberg, Prussia being expressly excluded, and the representative of Bavaria being constituted permanent chairman.§ The remaining committees, which contained formerly only three members, and so were more easily subjected to the influence of the president's nominee, are for the future to consist of four members.

---

\* Art. 7.

† Art. 11.

‡ Art. 19.

§ Art. 8.

Again, the administrative prerogatives of the Bundesrath are widely extended. Formerly it was only in the revenue department that it exercised the power of drawing up orders and dispositions for the carrying out of the law. This power is extended to every province where the constitution does not make an express provision to the contrary;\* that is to say, over and above certain exceptional provinces unassigned by the former constitution to the president, to the whole sphere of later legislation.

The president was but poorly compensated for the loss of so much substantial power by the addition to his dignity implied in the new title of Emperor. The adoption of this title was, however, not without significance, inasmuch as it was a sort of guarantee for the further development of the constitution on the English, or parliamentary, rather than on the American, or presidential, pattern. It also obviated a certain confusion in the terms formerly employed. The old constitution recognised none of the sovereigns of the confederated States as such, but only in the persons of their representatives assembled in the Bundesrath. The different prerogatives of the chief magistrate were attached to him, not as King of Prussia, but as President. The use of this word president, or "*präsidium*," involves, however, a continual equivocation. It is ordinarily used in the sense of President of the Bundesrath, in which case the person of the King of Prussia, like that of the remaining sovereigns, is absorbed in the person of his representative. But the president had certain prerogatives, as—*e.g.*, his command of the army, which were exercised irrespective of the Bundesrath. Here, then, the word *präsidium* signified President of the Bund, not President of the Bundesrath, and the personality of the King of Prussia, unlike that of the remaining sovereigns, was practically recognised. The nominal recognition of this fact, prevented in '67 by the jealousy of the minor princes, is secured by the adoption of the new title.

The old school of German patriots often complain, not without some justice, of the absence of anything like a charter of popular rights from the constitutions of '67 and '70. They point bitterly to the scheme of the old Frankfort Diet, and to the new December constitution of Austro-Hungary, both of which contrast curiously in this respect with the latest product of German political thought. Where, say they, are the "*State-ground-laws*" guaranteeing freedom to the citizen's person, the liberty of the press, the sanctity of the private letter, the equality of all classes before the law? Instead of these they find a mere dynastic contrivance for turning a number of monarchies into a monarchy. The rights of the princes are scrupulously guarded,

---

\* Art. 7, clause 2.

the duties of the people sedulously defined, but the charters extorted from time to time from the several princes are ignored, and nothing is substituted in their place. The only popular right offered by the constitution is that of common citizenship (*staatsburgerrecht*) and even this is more or less illusive, inasmuch as to become citizen of the Bund a man must first become citizen of one of the confederated States.\* There is no distinct method appointed for obtaining the common or federal citizenship as such. Let us consider how much weight is to be given to these objections. First, what is to be said in answer to the favourite comparison with Austria? Here it is important to distinguish the political conditions in which the two countries found themselves after Sadowa. Austria, the many-tongued and many-nationed, had suffered for years from a centralizing despotism—a régime which was opposed to the very conditions of her political existence. Hence a constitution which attempted to consolidate the forms of imperial unity, without at the same time giving freer play to the independent voice of the subject, would have been in her case a mere parody of legislation. But Germany—one in race, language, and sentiment—had long wished for what her neighbours had often wished away—a government which should make its voice heard above the local gossip of the petty courts, and speak with authority in the councils of the great European nations. Hence the one paramount thing to be done was to secure a basis for a government of this description, to solve the first difficulty without going out to meet a second. Another thing to be said is, that the majority of the confederated States had been provided, mainly during the last fifty years, with charters of a certain fashion,† and that the fusion of these into a common German charter was a work rather for the jurist than the diplomatist, hence better deferred till the framework of the new constitution had been completed. For the rest it was not perhaps without a certain honest satisfaction that the German people saw offered to them, after years of political inaction, a scheme which spoke of duties rather than of rights, of burdens rather than of privileges, of national honour and influence rather than of inglorious leisure or provincial autonomy.

We are now in a position to take a comprehensive view of the movement of 1870, to define its general character and determine its direction. It has often been remarked that large

---

\* Art. 3.

† A comparison of the various charters obtaining in North Germany in 1867, may be found in Dr. Glaser's book, "*Die preussische Verfassung mit den entsprechenden Bestimmungen der Verfassungen von Hannover, Nassau, Schleswig-Holstein, Kurhessen und Frankfurt, a. m. zusammengestellt.*" Berlin. 1867.

measures of political reconstruction, to be successful, require a strong external impulse to stimulate the national consciousness and bring home to the hearts of the people the necessity of common action. It is this element of success which, absent or insufficiently present in 1864 and 1866, gives the movement of 1870 its thoroughness and historical importance. In many respects no doubt the constitution of the German Empire is inferior to that of the North German Confederation; it has less right than its predecessor to be styled imperial, nor can the assumption of a sounding title disguise this fact. But its artistic imperfection is the earnest of its permanence, and constitutes to the eye of the practical politician its chief merit. Let us take a glance back at its principal features, in order to form an opinion as to the mode of its future development.

The German Empire is a union of federated States armed with a strong central power to repel foreign attack, and headed for this purpose by a hereditary commander-in-chief. In this respect it resembles a monarchy of the national pattern. Indeed, if there be a distinction, it is in favour of the federal State, as a government thus limited in competence will be less likely to let home considerations interfere with its foreign policy. The empire is armed likewise with an executive for home purposes which is headed by the same hereditary chief, but whose power in this province is materially modified by the following restrictions. In the first place, a minister, the Chancellor of the Empire, is responsible for all his actions to the representatives of the people. Secondly, each of his chief officials is assisted, or hindered, as the case may be, by small boards of four, elected by the federal council, and invested with certain indefinite powers of suggestion and interference, for every province of domestic administration. Thirdly, his executive power is limited except in the purely administrative departments, such as the Post and the Telegraphs, by a distinction, peculiar to the German constitution, between the right of executive disposition, "*verordnungsrecht*," and the right of simple execution, "*verwaltungsrecht*." The first of these rights is entrusted to the council, the second only to the chief of the executive. Even of the purely administrative departments, the council exercises the right of disposition in one of the most important—viz., the department of the revenue, where the president has only a limited right of veto.

The empire is provided also with a central legislature, which may be described generally as a legislature in which exceptional power is given to minorities—minorities however which represent not so much divergencies of popular opinion as divergencies of vested princely interests. The body which represents these

vested interests exercises some of the functions of a cabinet, inasmuch as its meetings are secret and not limited to session-time, and its consent necessary before the introduction of a Government Bill into the Lower House; besides all and more than all the functions of a House of Peers, inasmuch as it holds in its hands half, instead of a third, of the sovereign power in legislation, the president's veto being only recognised in exceptional cases.

It will perhaps be thought paradoxical to maintain in the face of this description that the type of government to which the German Empire is destined eventually to conform is the English or Constitutional type, modified however by the absence of a House of Peers. Strong reasons however may be given for the maintenance of this opinion. First, the Empire will not revert to the old principle of a Staatenbund, for the simple reason that a closer union of the federated States implies greater strength, less expense, greater effectiveness, and is more in harmony with the popular sentiment. It will not adopt an elective president, because, even granting that such a change would be salutary, the country is not prepared to throw aside monarchical institutions. The existence of the chancellor and his responsible position in the Reichstag are guarantees that the executive will not, as in America, be divorced from the legislature. In the struggle between the Chancellor and the Bundesrath for the lion's share of the executive power there can be little doubt to whose hands the victory will ultimately fall. Even if we had not the events of the last three years to teach us, it might be concluded, *à priori*, that a board of irresponsible and many-minded advisers could never hold its own against a single vigorous will backed by the public opinion of a nation. The struggle between the Reichstag and the Bundesrath for the upper hand in legislation must in the same way be decided, sooner or later, in favour of the Reichstag, if for no other reason, because publicity is in these days an indispensable condition of power. There is reason to believe, then, that while the Bundesrath falls gradually into decay, the heads of the various administrative departments will, step by step, assume the position of responsible ministers under the presidency of the Chancellor, and that the Reichstag will, in the same way, acquire the authority, as it tends more and more to support the burdens, of a single chamber. That the Bundesrath committees will develop into regular offices of State, or the Bundesrath into a constitutional House of Peers, is not indeed impossible, but, to say the least, highly improbable. That the present state of things will continue seems still more improbable. A body so grotesquely constituted, so loaded with prerogative, and so incapable of exercising it, com-

binning the functions of a board of feudal sovereigns of an Upper House of Parliament and of a modern Cabinet, appears so obviously transitional that we can hardly credit it with a permanent vitality. But history is full of surprises, and Englishmen are perhaps rather too apt to criticize contemptuously the political experiments of other nations. At any rate, there can be no doubt that the natural death of the Bundesrath, if it is to take place at all, has been considerably deferred by the greatly extended powers which the new Constitution confers on it. Whatever, therefore, has been offered in the way of conjecture must be accepted, as it has been advanced, with caution. The future of the Bundesrath, as well as the ultimate political form to be assumed by the Empire, remain questions to which history alone can render a sufficient answer.

But before Parliamentary institutions can ever be given a fair trial in Germany, the popular habits of thought outside Parliament must undergo some important modifications. Government by an individual is a simple matter enough, because here the force requisite for governing is supplied by a single will. In like manner, government by a class is facilitated by the prejudices and traditional policy of the dominant order. But government by the aggregate of adult male citizens, irrespective of distinctions based on birth, wealth, or education, is only possible under certain fixed conditions. The individuals composing the nation must show themselves capable of self-organization, nay more, to borrow a metaphor from the natural world, of a certain material cohesion; that is to say, they must be able not only to organize themselves in times of political crisis so as to give a decisive yes or no to any important question, but also, when no such question is uppermost, to crystallize themselves by the force of some sort of political dogma, strong enough to constitute an article of faith, even when all immediate causes of excitement are absent. There are times in the history of nations in which a whole people is of one mind in the prosecution of a certain line of policy. The attitude of the German people in the summer of 1870 was eminently a case of this sort. But it is not in these crises that a nation's capacity for self-government is best tested. It is rather in the succeeding times of reaction and depression, when the noise of the battle has ceased and the "mourners go about the streets," that we look for the promise of a new order of things and watch to hear the stir of a nation which has resolved to govern itself. It becomes, then, a question of paramount importance, in considering the future constitutional history of Germany, how far German political opinion is capable of permanent self-organization; for in this question is involved the further one, how far is the German nation capable of sustain-

ing that form of government which may be described as the alternative predominance of one of two sets of political principles?

The main historical disadvantage which has hindered the growth of any such system in Germany is the absence of a leisured aristocracy, possessed of authority, energy, and ability, to receive the sceptre resigned by the monarch, and hand on the traditions of government unbroken to the classes beneath it. The English aristocracy of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a body of men with leisure enough to devote itself disinterestedly to the study of politics, with ability enough to stand forward as the natural leaders of the bourgeois and yeomen, with energy enough to prefer the honours of a magistrate or a lord-lieutenant to the enervating pleasures of a luxurious capital, is an institution which has no parallel in the corresponding history of other European nations. Hence we find the Germans of the present century face to face with universal suffrage and the ballot, without power or experience to wield the instruments entrusted to them. There is a gap in the political development of the nation. There exists no powerful political class intermediate between the monarchs and the people. The German graf and the French comte no more resemble an English lord than an Indian Nabob resembles a Governor-General. The absence of authoritative leaders to give a practical direction to public opinion has rendered the different political sections incoherent and disorganized. We find the country split up into a number of microscopic parties, each of which, as in the slides of a kaleidoscope, is continually assuming new phases and forming fresh combinations. How much has been done of late years to remedy this state of affairs?

First among these parties is to be noticed the Prussian Conservative party. Its members are chiefly drawn from the so-called Junker class, a class of society whose narrow militarism, feudal loyalty to the Prussian Crown, and utter ignorance of modern ideas, have been illustrated *ad nauseam* by recent journalists and pamphleteers. The other political extreme is represented by the ultra-democratic or Socialist party, which at present, however, numbers but few followers. But the dominant political party, the party to whose co-operation Prince Bismarck owes much of his success, is the National-Liberal party. It sprung into existence out of the ruins of the Little-German and Great-German parties, into which the country was divided before the Austro-Prussian War, and its watchword has been "political freedom by means of national unity." It may appear at first sight curious to find a party of professedly liberal opinions desiring to centre political power in hands so despotic as those of King

William and the "Iron Count." But it must be remembered that a big despot is very preferable to a little despot. Nothing is more absurd than to identify the petty principedoms and dukedoms of the old Bund with liberalism of any kind. The Germans were right in requiring the downfall of the petty princes as the indispensable condition of their political emancipation, and Count Bismarck did good service in recalling his countrymen to the region of hard fact and political possibility. It has not been attempted to give a complete list of the German parties. These main divisions are further divided and cross-divided into an infinite number of minute sections, which it would be tedious to enumerate, and impossible exactly to define.

But independent of these purely political divisions there remains one further party which should not be left unnoticed. This is the party which would fain subordinate the magistrate to the priest, the noble to the bishop, the king or kaiser to the pope. The late conflict between the bishops and the government in Bavaria has revealed its extravagant pretensions, and the great middle-class of Germany seems determined to resist these pretensions to the utmost. To this feeling Count Bismarck in his late speeches has given full and daring expression. The German mind is averse alike to ecclesiastical despotism and to religious anarchy. On the one hand it resents the dictation of a Catholic hierarchy dominated by an Italian priest. Indeed some few enthusiasts see in the late so-called Döllinger movement the dawn of a new Reformation which will restore to the Germans of Bavaria and Austria the religious freedom enjoyed for three centuries by their northern brethren. On the other hand it has no taste for parties in religion, and would not tolerate the conversion of its Imperial Parliament into an arena for the fighting-out of religious squabbles. That peculiar characteristic of English life, the disintegration of religious opinion, which manifests itself in a revolt against all uniformity whether of doctrine or of discipline, and carries the forms of political warfare into the church and the meeting-house, accords ill with the sobriety of our more contemplative neighbours.

In conclusion, the present state of political parties may be briefly described as follows. The Government is supported by a strong central party, strictly German in its ends, reforming in its policy, reflecting the wishes of the majority of the people. Opposed to this stand three parties which represent rather sectional interests than any wide-spread popular sentiment, the old Prussian Conservatives, the Ultramontanes, and the Ultra-Democrats. It is inconceivable that any one of these parties should for the present gain strength enough to command a majority in the Reichstag. The rule of a country by a really



national government, supported by a really national party, and undisturbed by political aspirants whose opposition is based on personal rivalry as much as on distinction of principle, has of course much which is attractive in it. But it has its dangers as well as its advantages. The danger is that such a state of things cannot be expected to last, and when once it comes to an end the country is left helpless with nothing to substitute for what it has lost. The present unanimity of political opinion is due partly to the Chancellor's personal ascendancy, partly to the great national impulse created by the war with France. But supposing a great question to arise which should divide the camp of the National-Liberals and dissolve the sympathy which at present binds the Chancellor to the nation, what other man or what other party would be in a position to command the support of the nation? The consequence of such a rupture would perhaps be a temporary reaction in favour of monarchism. The Emperor would probably gather up the reins that had fallen from the hands of his great minister, and hold them till in the fulness of time a successor appeared fit to take his place. In France, in the event of M. Thiers' fall from power, no such ready solution of the difficulty would be practicable. Instead of reverting to personal government, the nation would possibly relapse into anarchy. In both countries, however, essentially the same problem would be presented. Let German and French statesmen see to it, that the event, if it take place, find them not unprepared.

In the above sketch of one, perhaps the most immediately important, side of modern German life, all reference to ancient German sentiment has been avoided. No one can have lived during the past year on the Continent without being struck by the studious avoidance on the part of all contemporary writers of the pet mediævalisms of the last century, and the determination to embark in the new political enterprise unbound by misleading fancies or barren traditions. No doubt the Germans are a sentimental people; none but a sentimental people could have ratified, out of pure love for an idea—the great idea of German unity—the extravagant demands of the South German Courts embodied in the treaties of Versailles. But this sentiment has little in common with the old sentiment, which clung around the traditions of the Holy Empire; it is practical and national rather than dreamy and cosmopolitan. The Germans have much to learn and much to do. The world of fact is but opening to them. They have yet to crown the edifice, to prove that their unity is no mere form, their constitution no mere machinery, but an organism in which each citizen works his part, as member of a common body. Hitherto they have lacked the keen sagacity

and bold initiative of their brother Teutons. It cannot be said of them, as of their brethren across the sea, that "their sound is gone out into all lands, and their words into the ends of the world." Nor can it be said of them that they have invented the form of political government, to which, in the words of a French writer, all modern nations must conform or die. But they have done much else to deserve well of the world. Let us wish them God-speed in what they have yet to do.

---

### ART. III.—THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF WALES.

1. *A University for Wales*, No. 1. 1864.
2. *Report of the Welsh Education Conference at Aberystwyth*. 1870.
3. *The "Aberystwyth Observer," "Wrexham Advertiser," and "Wrexham Guardian."* 1869—1871.
4. *Report on the University*. 1871.
5. *Outline of the Proposed Constitution of the University College of Wales*. 1872.

NEARLY twenty years ago, a few earnest and patriotic Welsh gentlemen met in London to consider the anomalous state of their country in its want of any high-class national college or university. Since then meetings have been held, speeches made, subscriptions levied, and buildings bought, but the university has not been opened. We propose in this paper to show—1, Why a university should be at once established in Wales; 2, Why it has not been established before this; and 3, What has been done towards the realization of so important an undertaking.

We have a strong conviction that the establishment of a university in Wales is one of those practical measures which deeply concern the well-being not of Wales only but of that larger community of which it forms an integral part, and the movements of which must necessarily be hindered or advanced according to the retardation or progress of the smaller member. A moment's reflection will suffice to show that not only the progress, but the permanence, of that general civilization, of which popular improvement is but one of many consequences, depends on the completeness of the higher instruction of the country. And this for many reasons, the more prominent of which we proceed to state.

However energetically we may bestir ourselves to check vice and put down crime, we can never hope to succeed, even proximately, so long as we do not attempt to impart the greatest amount of the highest instruction to the greatest number of possible recipients; for we lose the most powerful means we possess of influencing the ruling spirits of society, of whose views its laws and institutions are, or ought to be, the expression.

We do injustice to our children, for in so far as the philosophy of this age is the popular thought of the next, the lower instruction is nourished by the higher, and if the latter were not scientifically accurate and exposed to the constant criticism of a learned class, it is evident that the popular thought would soon become indefinitely degraded. Ordinary men of business must to a large extent take for granted the economical and historical theories and facts which are imparted to them by professional men, who are supposed to scorn delights and live laborious days; and in proportion as we reduce the number and lower the standard of this class, so inevitably do we degrade the quality of the intellectual pabulum which it is their duty and privilege to supply to the general community. In the absence of professional scholars to guide, to criticize, and to teach us, our speculations would run riot in a wilderness of crudities and error.

Universities afford the best and almost indeed the sole retreat of comparative leisure, where learned men may take refuge from the noise and distractions of ordinary life. Leisure is more necessary even to the *savant* than to the poet. Men who are constantly engaged in active business cannot afford the time necessary to refer to general principles for rules of immediate action, and hence must be content to inherit or accept them on trust from those who have the leisure, ability, and tastes required for such investigations. If, then, our men of action cannot retire into their studies, they must provide themselves with those who can. It is only the man of thought who can supply the levers by which the world is moved. An eloquent writer, in treating some years ago of Scotch Universities, dwelt largely on this very point, and brought forward Scotland as perhaps the most memorable instance known to history of the benefits which, even as regards their external prosperity, one single theorist may bestow on whole generations. "It is to an old Glasgow professor of logic, whose own business transactions, for purposes of experiment, must have been pretty much on a par with those of Diogenes, that Europe is indebted for that science, the direct object of which was the supply of our physical wants, and for those principles of trade, by the practical application of which in our own day, second-rate economists have gained reputations scarcely inferior to that of their great discoverer. If Adam

Smith had been a merchant or a banker it is scarcely probable that even he would have been able to view economics sufficiently in the abstract to enable him to raise them to the dignity of a science." Within the walls of the same venerable building, too, did James Watt find refuge when excluded from following his occupation as a mathematical instrument maker in the city, owing to his not having served his apprenticeship with the trades there, and in the classic hush of the old quadrangle bring the steam-engine to perfection. But why ransack the past for instances, when at this moment a northern university numbers among its professors one who is virtually the director-in-chief of the telegraphy of this country, and who may almost be said to hold in his hands the issues of that infinite network of cables and electric wire, which knits together the nations of the globe? Bearing these facts in mind, may we not fairly attribute the rarity of great Welsh *savans*, scholars, and inventors, whose names are known beyond their native hills, to the non-existence in their midst of an educational institution of the higher order? But the effects of this want have a still wider range.

Ordinary scholars who have no university to look forward to are deprived of a powerful incentive to study and to wait. The son of a Scottish farmer who aims at qualifying himself for one of the learned professions looks on his tasks and lessons even when at school as part of the business of life, a thorough mastery of which will form the best preparation for his university career and studies, and enable him to grapple successfully with his competitors in the lecture-room. The university, again, takes the conceit out of a man, being the best of levellers. The dux of the parish school is proud of his achievements, and apt in his ignorance to think himself a much cleverer fellow and better informed than he really is. Having distanced his school-mates in the race for honours he goes to college eager for the fray, and full of confidence, overweening, though happily but short-lived. For, unless he happen to be an exceptional prodigy, it is a hundred to one but he finds himself tripped up and beaten over and over again before he has been many weeks matriculated. Lads find their level in the university classroom as soon and as certainly as do members in the House of Commons. It is only after they have, to some extent, found out their shortcomings and taken the measure of their fellow-students, that, if they have anything in them, they buckle themselves to the fight in real earnest, with some prospect of success, and learn those habits of dogged perseverance and self-reliance which form so prominent a feature of the Scottish character—thanks mainly to Scottish Universities. It is evident on the face of it, that this want of the higher instruction in Wales

must greatly cripple and depress the energies of her people. In fact, so long as the country is without a national college, she is engaged in a race with three neighbouring rivals and partners whom she cannot expect to keep up with, much less pass, being so heavily and exceptionally weighted. That this is no mere fancy, is evidenced by the fact to which reference has already been made—namely, that while Welsh children are naturally quick and intelligent, and up to a certain age precocious, so few Welshmen have ever attained distinction as scholars. And the same pernicious and blighting influences extend to every department of commercial, social, and political life. Welshmen, for instance, who cross the borders into England, find themselves competing at a disadvantage with their more favoured rivals. "The Welsh-speaking workman," observes Mr. P. Mostyn Williams, in an excellent paper read before the Educational Conference at Aberystwyth, in January, 1870, "seldom rises superior to a workman, and scarcely ever attains the position of the administrative classes." Nations are but congregated individuals, and if the competition between two or more of them is to be healthy and fair, they must be equally equipped. Except on this ground, it is impossible to account for the backward state of so thrifty, careful, industrious, and shrewd a people as the Welsh. Is it not therefore deplorable that while the material wealth and prosperity of the Principality—her mines and manufactures, railways and shipping interests, are hourly increasing in importance, and the demand for skilled labour, scientific, engineering, and linguistic acquirements is necessarily becoming hourly more imperative, no means should be taken to meet the emergency or increase the supply? Surely if coals and cotton, fine linen and purple, are good for the body, philosophy and science are good for the soul!

The inevitable result of all this is that when men of education and scientific training are wanted to fill important offices, the Welsh have to cross the borders and recruit their ranks from Scotch and English candidates. A glance at the recently published statistics of the Queen's College, Galway, one of the smallest colleges in Ireland, and attended by barely a twentieth of the number of students who matriculate yearly at the University of Edinburgh or of Glasgow, will show how much Wales is losing annually by her suicidal stinginess.

From these statistics it appears that since the opening of the college, in 1850, 1126 students have entered for study in the faculties of arts, medicine, and law, and in the department of engineering. Of this number, 381 were Protestant Episcopalians, 516 Roman Catholics, 182 Presbyterians, and 48 of other denominations. Of these, 95 have obtained Government appoint-

ments; 3 have obtained studentships at the Inns of Court in Dublin and London; 356 have obtained degrees and diplomas in arts, medicine, law, and engineering; and 147 are at present on the books for the session, of whom 83 are Roman Catholics, 30 Episcopalians, 28 Presbyterians, and 6 of other denominations. The Government appointments alluded to were—25 in the Civil Service of India, comprising judges of district courts, engineering, and the telegraph departments; 40 in the army medical service, 17 in the navy medical service; 4 inspectors of national schools; 2 inspectors of constabulary; and 7 “home appointments, War Office, &c.” Of these 95, the Protestant Episcopalians numbered 32, the Roman Catholics 45, the Presbyterians 13, and those of other denominations 5.

While steps have from time to time been taken to increase the number and efficiency of elementary schools, where the poorer classes are taught, no corresponding effort has been made to meet the demands of the upper and middle classes for first-class tuition. Who are to blame for all this? Assuredly, the Welsh themselves, whose most Protestant and Christian Principality is the only one in Europe that does not possess a single national college or school. In saying this, we are not forgetful that there are colleges in Wales, but these are of a purely sectarian or denominational kind, and afford an outlet for native talent in one direction only—namely, the ministry. Of such are the institutions in different parts of North and South Wales, as for instance at Lampeter\* (in connexion with the Established Church), at Carmarthen, Brecon, Pontypool, Haverfordwest, Bala, Trevecca, and Llangollen. But these, although so far as we know, excellent in their way, are all more or less sectarian, and of necessity lack that catholicity and wide range of subject and sympathies which a university should have, and must have, if it aims at representing not any one class or profession, but the entire community, with its multifarious aspirations and aims. Compared with almost any civilized Principality or State of equal size and population in Europe or the Colonies, Wales cuts but a sorry figure.

In view of the prominence given to the educational condition of Germany by the late war, we need but refer to that country, every State in which has at least one, while many have more universities, of which there are about thirty in the country altogether. Baden, with a population not larger than that of Wales, has two, and a mere enumeration of the number, not of students, but of professors and lecturers alone, at each of these

---

\* Since writing the above we have been led to understand that a proposal from the authorities of Lampeter College, to unite with the University College, towards the establishment of the university, is now under special consideration.

institutions takes away one's breath. Thus, Berlin University has 150; Leipsic, 97; Göttingen, 88; Breslau, 80; Bonn, 70; Halle, 60; Königsberg, 53, and so on down to the smallest State. If, again, we take the average number of students attending each university, we find that it exceeds 900, giving the enormous total of 27,000. Or turn to the other Continental countries. Italy boasts of no fewer than 20 universities; Austria has 7; Belgium, 4; Holland, 3; Denmark, 2; Norway, 1; Sweden, 2; Switzerland, 3; and in France we have the Royal University, consisting of 26 colleges, besides another institution of a similar nature and size. If we go even to the Colonies we find half-civilized territories—mere mushroom growths of yesterday—with their universities and colleges. New Zealand has one; Australia has two; Canada has several; while the colleges and medical schools in the United States are legion.

An outsider might think that even if patriotism, self-interest, and an honest desire for the well-being of the general community, were insufficient to stimulate the Welsh into erecting and endowing a university for themselves, a lively and excusable jealousy of their more favoured neighbours over the marshes and across the Channel might serve the purpose. For more years than we care to count, Wales has been taxed to build and support universities and schools in England, Scotland, and Ireland. The proportion of taxation which she has borne for that purpose during the present century would, if summed up, be sufficient to build and endow a separate college in every one of her twelve counties. Scotland, with little more than twice the population of Wales, has for upwards of three hundred years been in possession of four great universities, where some 4000 students are annually being trained, besides smaller medical schools, like the Glasgow Andersonian University. Some time ago, when it was resolved to erect new buildings for the Glasgow University, the professors threw themselves on the generosity of the public, who subscribed upwards of 147,000*l.*, which the Government of the day supplemented by a grant of 120,000*l.* It is in Ireland, however, that we see the greatest signs of activity in providing high-class instruction. By the Act 8 and 9 Vic., c. 66, passed in 1845 for the establishment of new colleges in that country, the Lords of the Treasury were authorized to issue the sum of 100,000*l.* to purchase land, and an annual sum of 7000*l.* to each college. Hence what are called the Queen's Colleges, at Belfast, Cork, and Galway, which were opened in November, 1849. In connexion with these institutions the Queen's University was also established for conducting examinations and granting degrees. At the same time the Roman Catholic college of Maynooth was placed on a new footing,

receiving 30,000*l.* for new buildings and a permanent endowment for the support of 520 students. In 1870 we find that the Queen's Colleges received from the Imperial Exchequer 8000*l.* each, which, with 3240*l.* to the Queen's University, and 1684*l.* to the Royal Irish Academy, makes a total of 30,000*l.* for one year, irrespective of the enormous sum of 342,512*l.* 8*s.* 10*d.*, which was paid in annuities and allowances to the staff of teachers under the Irish Board of National Education, only 17·7 per cent. of which was contributed by local sources. The Scotch Universities during the same year came in for 15,584*l.*, besides a special grant of 20,000*l.* to that of Glasgow, and the London University was voted a sum of 9577*l.* Of England we need not farther speak. Throughout the civilized globe her universities are familiar as household words, and the revenue of Oxford or Cambridge exceeds that of many a Continental State.

We feel almost ashamed to have written so much in support of a proposition, the truth of which ought to be as self-evident as that two and two make four; but in presence of a million and a half of civilized and presumably intelligent people who have been content for ages to do without any higher instruction than what is to be had in elementary schools, we cannot flatter the public so much as to think our arguments superfluous. We are glad to know however that the Welsh, or at least a portion of the community, have at last bestirred themselves, and that there is every prospect that a great national university will be opened at Aberystwyth in October next. But in order that the University College of Wales should be the great, influential, and cosmopolitan institution that it ought to be, it will be necessary that not a mere section of the Welsh public, but the whole Welsh people take it in hand, and enter into the scheme with spirit. Up to the present moment the work of agitation and organization has fallen on the shoulders of an earnest and unselfish few, like the late Mr. W. W. Williams, M.P.; Mr. G. Osborne Morgan, M.P.; Mr. Henry Richard, M.P.; Mr. Hugh Owen, Mr. Morgan Lloyd, Thomas Nicholas, Ph.D.; Mr. Stephan Evans, Mr. G. F. Roberts, Mr. Jonathan Pell, and the present Secretary, the Rev. D. Charles, D.D., not to mention other honourable names connected with the movement; while the subscription list includes the merest fraction of the upper and middle classes in the Principality. A large proportion of the money subscribed comes from Manchester, Liverpool, and London. The late Mr. Williams, M.P., and Mr. Samuel Morley, M.P., head the sheet with 1000*l.* each. Mr. David Davis, Aberdare, and Mr. Lewis Davis, Cardiff, follow with 500*l.* each; Mr. Watkin Williams, M.P., with half that sum, and Sir R. B. W. Bulkeley, Bart., Baron Hill, Mr. Darbi-



shire, Conway ; Messrs. Lewis, Humphreys, & Co., Manchester, Sir Pryse Pryse, Bart., Messrs. Roberts and Son, Liverpool, and Mr. W. Waters subscribe each 200*l.* After these come one 150*l.*, one 105*l.*, and thirty 100*l.*, with forty-four sums of from 75*l.* to 20*l.*, making in all about 16,000*l.* This, though in itself a respectable sum, falls ridiculously short of what we should have expected from a Principality with upwards of a million and a half of population. In presence of such short-sighted niggardliness, it is almost startling to be told that Wales had at one time not only one, but two universities. So long ago as the fourth century, there was a university at Bangor-is-y-coed, and another in South Wales. Is this age less generous and enlightened than its rude and barbarous predecessors of a thousand years ago ? It would almost seem so. Most of our present institutions were founded by the munificence of an age when cultivation was confined to the few. What might we not expect now if a similar sympathy could be evoked on behalf of the higher education for the vastly broader basis of the popular intelligence of Wales in the nineteenth century ! If the general voice pronounce that efficient instruction and a generous cultivation of literature, science, and philosophy are not less indispensable to the national well-being than popular schools, mechanics' institutes, and penny papers, surely the Principality, with its wealthy landowners, its populous cities, its thriving ports, its leagues of rail and far-extending mines of mineral, is not so poor as to be unable to supply the conditions of their existence, nor so weak as to be unable to make its claim heard in Parliament. Will it not be a want of all true patriotism if the people do not respond liberally to the call now made upon them to subscribe to the University College of Wales, and if their members fail to urge the claims of that institution for immediate support, and an annual grant corresponding in liberality to the subsidies that have been already accorded to the other portion of the empire ?

On the question why a university has not been sooner established in Wales, we need dwell but briefly. The causes which have combined to retard the progress of the University College of Wales are many and various, but the more important of them may be classed under one or other of the following heads :—

1. *The Isolation and Poverty of the People.*—The Welsh are to all intents and purposes a distinct and separate people. Obedient to the laws and loyal to the Crown, but in language, tradition, habit, and religion living as isolated from the rest of the country as if they were removed a thousand miles away. Nine-tenths of them, again, are poor, and the remaining tenth, who possess the land, the wealth, and power of the country, have

not come forward as a body to support the university. Another drawback is the sparseness of the population, which makes it difficult, and in many cases impossible, for the promoters of the scheme to get together large masses of people, or to canvass personally small and scattered communities.

"Everybody," remarks a recent writer in the *Saturday*, "has had occasion to observe the singular influence of sympathy in multiplying emotion. An ordinary man hears a platitude with a feeble sense of approval of which he is scarcely conscious. Place him in the midst of a couple of thousand of like-minded persons, and the same sentiment to which he listened with almost complete indifference may rouse him to a frenzy of excitement."

How much more so when the speeches do not consist of platitudes but of a strong and compact array of facts.

2. *Religious differences.*—Nowhere in the kingdom is there a brisker competition between different sects than in Wales. In England there may be found a greater number of denominations, supported, however, especially in the larger towns, by a vast outlying population, which affords to each body a large and distinct field of action. In the greater part of Wales, on the other hand, the outlying population has long ago been exhausted, and even in small villages we find three and even four different sects in active rivalry. Roughly speaking, seven-eighths of the Welsh people are Dissenters and poor, the remaining fraction being Churchmen and rich, and there is unfortunately an antagonism between the two which tends to make each party jealous of the other, and more than anything has retarded the progress of the university movement. This jealousy is not only suicidal and selfish, but, as we mean to show in the sequel, utterly unreasonable, the constitution of the University College being perfectly unsectarian, and built, indeed, on the widest and most catholic basis.

Although the proposal of a national university has been before the public for twenty years, it is pitiful to think that not more than 18,000*l.* have been promised as subscriptions during all that time. Why, in the west of Scotland, by a mere section of the country, nine times that sum was subscribed for one out of four universities, and in one-tenth of the time. The truth seems to be that only a few earnest and unselfish men have thrown themselves heartily into the movement, while the great bulk of the people, the leading men and large proprietors, and, strangest of all, the majority of the Welsh Members of Parliament, have stood coldly aloof, and either refused to subscribe, or doled out a wretched pittance, as if it were given in charity. Even as a commercial speculation, considering the extraordinary bargain made by the committee in purchasing the buildings, the scheme is worth all encouragement, and if a limited liability company.

were to take it up and issue a prospectus, they would speedily make it a success, and realize comfortable dividends.

3. We come now to consider the arguments which have been advanced against the establishment of a university. In the first place, we are told that such an institution would tend powerfully to foster a purely Welsh nationality, and promote the separation of the inhabitants from the English community. Nothing could be shallower than this. We have but to look once again at Scotland, in one sense an intensely national country, and for ages separated by a deep gulf of bitterness and jealousy from her southern sister. Do we find that the encouragement of the higher education across the borders has widened this feeling of estrangement, contracted the national tone, making it less cosmopolitan and catholic, and more provincial and selfish, as the people have risen in wealth, intelligence, and power? Surely not. The whole tendency of modern civilization is to assimilate races and gradually to eliminate provincialisms of dialect, manners, thought, and race. At times we may regret that it is so. Enthusiastic Highlanders naturally think with a pang of regret how, away amid the wild glens and gorges of Argyleshire hills, a magnificent language, rich in legendary lore and song, is slowly but surely dying out, until by-and-by the dialects in which Ossian sang, and the mothers of Morven wailed their wild dirges for the brave who had gone down in battle, will have utterly passed from the tongues of men. But why kick our feet against the pricks? why make faces at the inevitable? Celtic enthusiasts may found a Gaelic chair at Edinburgh, Professor Blackie may sing the praises of a language he cannot speak, and the Highland Society may award prizes for the best original composition in Erse; but the gallant efforts of these linguistic Tories to stem the tide of Saxon conquest but remind one of Mrs. Partington and the ocean. The interests of Wales, we presume, demand that her people should, in reality as well as politically, become an integral of the United Kingdom. Free intercourse between the two communities is essential if Wales is not to fall back relatively in the wake of civilization. Without in any way depreciating or desiring the extinction of the vernacular language or native customs, we make bold to say that the hope of the country lies not in her festering a narrow spirit of mis-called patriotism, but in her nearer approximation to England in language, culture, and commercial enterprise. It is not the extinction of Welsh, but the diffusion of English, that is desired. Let the perpetuation of the former be left to the free choice of the people; but in the meantime let new streams be cut that may unite the two nations, and divert into Welsh channels the larger influences and newer currents of a higher civilization.

Lastly, it is argued, why go to the expense of establishing a university in Wales when you have Oxford and Cambridge to which to send your children? This would be unanswerable if it were only the few and not the many who were in want of education, and the fact may account in part for the apathy already referred to on the part of the wealthy classes. But while it is true that a minority of the population can afford to send their sons to the English universities, the vast majority are too poor even to think of it. The average cost of graduation in Oxford is stated by the Royal Commissioners at from 800*l.* to 1000*l.*, giving a residence of eighty-four weeks for four years, although the necessary expenses do not exceed from 300*l.* to 400*l.* We shall be within the mark if we set down the annual expenditure of an Oxford (and we suppose a Cambridge) student at 250*l.*, and most parents would think they got off cheaply even at that. This of course shuts the gates of these great seats of learning on at least seven-eighths of the Welsh people. Nor is this all. The atmosphere of Oxford is not so conducive to hard work as is that of her plebeian sisters across the Cheviots, where men go to study and not to play or to get into society, or to graduate because every gentleman graduates, but because it is in very truth the business of their life, on which their future prospects, position, and success entirely depend. Not only, then, must Wales have a university to herself, but that university must provide the best instruction at a moderate cost. It is notably so in Scotland, where the average expenditure of each student for the session of six months, *inclusive of class and matriculation fees*, does not, we are confident, exceed 50*l.*, while many contrive to live comfortably on 40*l.* and 30*l.*, and some to exist on less. "Tenui musam meditamur avenâ," Scottish students may say with Sydney Smith and Jeffrey. At least one-third of them are steeped in poverty, and have to fight a sublime struggle against terrific odds. Hundreds toil as carpenters, shopmen, teachers, reporters, druggists' assistants, copying clerks, and tutors during the summer months, in order to scrape together a few pounds to enable them to join college in November, and while there their necessities compel them to continue their manual labours in the workshop or at the desk, or as tutors in private families at from 10*s.* 6*d.* to one guinea a month, in order to keep body and soul together while they qualify themselves for a profession. In this way the benefits of a good education penetrate to a much lower class in Scotland than in England, and are accessible alike to the peer and to the peasant. "There is not," writes Mr. James Hannay—a thoroughly competent authority—a small tradesman or farmer or gamekeeper in Scotland who, if his son displays any symptoms of 'book-learning,' does not

think of the university as the proper 'field for the lad, and does not look forward to the day when he shall call his son 'Doctor,' or see him in a pulpit thumping the gospel out of the Bible." The Scotch system has, of course, its disadvantages, but this is not the place in which to discuss them, nor do they in any way affect our position, that what Wales must have is first-class tuition at a moderate cost, which combination it cannot possibly find at Oxford or Cambridge, even putting aside altogether the additional expenses which distant travelling beyond the limits of the Principality would entail on Welsh students at either of these places.

Having now made good our position, we proceed to show what has been done towards the establishment of a Welsh University. If the preceding arguments are sound—as we are convinced they are—the following propositions follow as corollaries:—1. The University College of Wales must be unsectarian. 2. The instruction provided must be high in quality, comprehensive in range, and moderate in price. And 3. The buildings should, if possible, be situated in a central and healthy locality. Let us inquire briefly how far the institution at Aberystwyth promises to fulfil these qualifications and requirements. As early as 1854 a few Welsh gentlemen met in London to consider what should be done to provide their native country with that higher instruction which it still wants. Nothing of immediate consequence resulted from the meeting, and the matter remained in abeyance for some ten years. In the meantime a pamphlet was published by Mr. B. T. Williams, barrister-at-law, advocating the claims of Wales to a national university, and several letters from the pen of Professor Nicholas, M.A., Ph.D., of Carmarthen College, appeared in some of the papers of the Principality, advocating the scheme of high class colleges and a university for Wales. On the 1st of December, 1863, a meeting was held at the Freemasons' Tavern, London, the late Mr. W. Williams, M.P., presiding, when resolutions were passed recommending the immediate prosecution of a movement for the establishment of a "truly national university, which should be completely free from all ecclesiastical preferences," and afford accessible means of liberal culture at a moderate cost. An Executive Committee was appointed, with the chairman, who generously put down his name for 1000*l.* towards the university fund, as treasurer. At a subsequent meeting held during the same month, Professor Nicholas undertook the secretaryship, and arrangements were made for opening an office in London, with a view to the successful and vigorous prosecution of the undertaking. Dr. Nicholas's connexion with the movement lasted four years, during which time he collected some 5700*l.* in cash, and as much again in promises. Upon his

resignation, at the close of 1867, the Rev. David Charles, A.B. (Oxon.) D.D., of Aberystwyth, was asked to fill the vacant office, and it is mainly to this gentleman's indefatigable industry, perseverance, and energy (his services for some time back being voluntary and gratuitous), that the scheme owes its present prospects of success. From time to time large and influential meetings have been held in the leading towns of Wales, as also in London, Liverpool, and Manchester, and the country generally has been canvassed for subscriptions. It is doubtful, however, if the movement would have prospered greatly if it had not been for the happy misfortune that threw into the market the magnificent and indeed colossal range of buildings in Aberystwyth originally known as the Castle House, and now as the University College of Wales, and enabled the Committee to purchase for 10,000*l.* an erection which had cost fully eight times that sum. Early in January, 1870, the secretary, Dr. Charles, took advantage of the National Educational Conference, then sitting at the College, Aberystwyth, to advocate the claims of the university on the support of the nation, and the very able report read by him on that occasion showed that the total amount of promises received up to that date was 16,781*l.* 10*s.* 8*d.*, of which 8,866*l.* 5*s.* had been paid.

As the Committee had calculated on 30,000*l.* as the sum required before they could open the university, this left them upwards of 13,000*l.* short—a mere bagatelle one would think for a country like Wales, but a bagatelle which has not been wiped off even yet. On June 21st, 1871, a deputation, consisting of Mr. H. Richard, M.P., Mr. Morgan Lloyd, Mr. Hugh Owen, and Dr. Charles, had an interview with the Premier and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to urge the propriety of a Government grant to the Welsh University. Although, of course, neither Mr. Gladstone nor Mr. Lowe would make any definite promise, the interest which they showed in the matter, and the manner in which they received the arguments addressed to them, led the deputation to anticipate the most favourable results. Six months later, in November, strenuous efforts were made simultaneously in Wales, Liverpool, Manchester, and London, to raise a guarantee fund of 2000*l.* for three years, towards the opening of the college, and such progress has been made as to encourage the Committee to fix the inauguration of the institution for the 1st of October, 1872.

The university buildings, as we have said, form a vast and imposing structure, overlooking the sea; and Aberystwyth, in which they are situated, may be regarded as the central town in Wales, from which railways radiate to every quarter. The building contains 150 bedrooms, and 50 large rooms, which are in

course of being fitted up as lecture-rooms, library, examination-hall, chapel, dining-hall, laboratory, museum, and common rooms. There are also dormitories and studying rooms for a considerable number of resident collegians, with accommodation in the lecture halls for 700 students, and residences for several Professors. The college is to be of the status of the University and King's Colleges, London, and is modelled on the combined constitutions of the Queen's Colleges and University of Ireland. The curriculum is to be adapted for the different professions, and to embrace special preparation for academic degrees. All other colleges and schools in Wales, whose course of study comes up to the recognised standard, are to be entitled to affiliate to the university, in the same way as the Queen's Colleges are affiliated to the University in Ireland, and the institution is to be open on equal terms to members of all denominations, there being of course no chair of theology, that being supplied by the various affiliated colleges.

Here, rightly, we should conclude, but are unwilling to leave the subject without one last word by way of what our Highland friends would call a "deoch-an-dhoris." The Welsh people have a splendid opportunity for doing justice to Cambria, and conferring a boon, inestimably precious and glorious, on all succeeding generations of Welshmen. By the efforts of a few earnest men they have been put in possession, at a merely nominal cost, of one of the most imposing piles of building in the kingdom, admirably suited in every respect for the requirements of a university. A trifling sum of some 8000*l.* is all that is required to start the college, and wipe out the reproach which has for centuries attached to the Principality. If this be subscribed at once, the Government cannot refuse to supplement it with a large and liberal subsidy, that will place the institution on a firm and certain basis. It only wants a little energy and spirit; and we can hardly think the Welsh so blind to all the calls of interest, honour, and patriotism, that they will fail to respond to the call. They have, at any rate, a splendid cause to plead, which they are sure to gain if heartily advocated, and we wait to see whether the aspirations of those who aim at what is best, or the apathy of those who are content with what is worst, shall prevail; whether the present movement—for want of a little timely liberality—will suffer an ignominious and ridiculous collapse, or will be carried out to a great and successful issue in the final establishment and endowment of a University College for Wales.

## ART. IV.—INDIA: THE MUSALMAN PANIC.

*Our Indian Musalmans: Are they bound in Conscience to Rebel against the Queen?* By W. W. HUNTER, LL.D., of Her Majesty's Bengal Civil Service. London: Trübner and Co. 1871.

IN general, the British public sleeps oblivious of India. If greatly importuned on the subject, they will mutter something about the "brightest jewel in the British crown," swear a prayer or two, and then to sleep again. At rare intervals, however, something happens which fairly arouses them, and then the result is exactly what might be expected of persons suddenly startled out of sleep. They behold men as trees walking. The Musalman panic is the most recent instance of an awakening of this kind. Dr. Hunter's work (which heads our article) had the good or evil fortune to be published when Parliament was not sitting, and the newspapers had abundance of spare room. Its appearance was shortly followed by the murder of Chief Justice Norman, at the hands of a Muhammadan fanatic; and the coincidence had the effect of turning everybody's attention to the East. Dr. Hunter's "Wahabees" became for a short time the theme of general conversation, and there can be little doubt that that portion of the English public who take any interest in India are now possessed by a belief that a really terrific religious conspiracy is undermining the British empire in India; or, as the *Spectator* put it, that it needs but the appearance of a "Musalman Cromwell," and a few words from "three Arabs of Mecca," to "overwhelm the empire in universal massacre." The object of the present paper is to show that Dr. Hunter's book is not a trustworthy account either of the Indian Musalmans generally, or of the Wahabees in particular.

Dr. Hunter is a writer very favourably known to the public, by his work entitled "The Annals of Rural Bengal," a book written in a charming style and which may fairly be considered as marking an epoch in the history of Anglo-Indian literature; as it proved to the satisfaction of all who read it, that the pre-eminent dulness hitherto attaching to Indian subjects was due to the dulness of those who treated of them, and not to the subjects themselves. We can imagine few things more beneficial to India than to have a man possessed of Dr. Hunter's graceful style and lively imagination (though we should like him also to be possessed of greater perseverance in



research, and a more exacting "historical conscience") in every one of the subordinate governments to delineate for the English world the life of the Indian peasant. In an evil hour, however, Mr. Hunter abandoned the districts of rural Bengal, and took upon himself to write about the Indian Musalman, of whom it is not too much to say that he knew absolutely nothing; and the result is a book, which is one series of errors and misleading statements from beginning to end. Dr. Hunter, one is almost tempted to suspect, sat down with malice prepense to terrify the ignorant and submissive British public as much as he could. He introduces us to "gigantic villains," such as were only produced in the declining days of the Roman Republic; atrocious butchers, who combine "the heartlessness of Oppianicus with the caution of Lentulus;" fanatical Caliphs who lead lives of mysterious seclusion in an intricate labyrinth of courtyards and palaces; swarms of preachers, "every one of whom is carefully nurtured in treason before he goes forth on his proselytizing work;" and to crown all there is an "army of the Crescent," hanging like a thunder-cloud on the summit of the hills closing in our north-western frontier, and drilled unceasingly to the sound of the most sanguinary ballads. Also to aid in the good work there is a Government—an inexplicable combination of knavery and folly—doing all it can to encourage sedition by a careful and thorough exclusion of the Musalman population from every profitable career, and an equally careful and systematic misappropriation of Muhammadan endowments. Luckily, however, for the British empire in India, and for those who dwell therein, the greater part of all these alarming statements have no existence beyond Dr. Hunter's imagination. If the empire is never assailed by a more formidable enemy than the Wahabee conspiracy, it has very little to fear indeed. We trust we shall make this clear before we have done. In order to do so, we shall extract some of the leading passages in Dr. Hunter's book, and point out where he has fallen into error upon matters of fact, or given an exaggerated importance to matters really of very little moment.

In the 1st chapter of the first edition of his book Mr. Hunter thus describes the career of Syud Ahmad, the originator of Indian Wahabeeism, in the Peshawur Valley:—

"In regular engagements the tumultuous army of the Crescent proved no-match for the disciplined cohorts of the Sikhs. In 1827 the Prophet led his bands against one of their entrenched camps, and was repulsed with great slaughter. But the lowland general dared not follow-up his success. The fanatical bands fell back across the Indus into the mountains, and so increased their fame by guerilla

successes, that the Sikh chief found himself compelled to buy the alliance of the very tribes who had been foremost in the raids. In 1829 the Lowlanders trembled for the safety of Peshawur itself, their frontier capital, and the Governor basely attempted to put an end to the war by poisoning the Prophet. The rumour inflamed the zeal of the Muhammadan highlanders to a red heat: They burst down in fury on the plains, massacred the infidel army, and mortally wounded its general. Peshawur was only saved by a force under Prince Sher Sing and General Ventura. The Prophet's influence had now spread as far as Cashmere, and troops from every discontented prince of Northern India flocked to his camp. Runjeet Sing, the head of the great Sikh confederacy, hurried up a force under his most skilful lieutenants. In spite of a reverse in 1830, the Apostolic army occupied the plains in overwhelming force; and before the end of the year Peshawur itself, the western capital of the Punjab, had fallen. This marks the culminating point in the Prophet's career. . . . But the dismay caused by the fall of Peshawur brought the matchless diplomacy of Runjeet Sing into the field. The wily Sikh detached the petty Muhammadan principalities from the army of the Crescent by separate appeals to their self-interest, and the Prophet found himself compelled to abandon the city on condition of a ransom being paid."

Further on (p. 27), Dr. Hunter alludes to this campaign as ending "in the occupation of the Punjab by the Fanatic Host, and the fall of the frontier capital."

The whole of this passage is pure romance. Nothing in the least resembling it ever took place from the beginning to the end of Syud Ahmad's career. In the first place, Syud Ahmad and his followers never crossed the Indus, and could not therefore have overrun the Punjab; in the next place, the Peshawur Valley was not annexed to Runjeet Sing's dominions until three years after the death of the Syud, and it is consequently wholly incorrect to speak of Peshawur as at that time the frontier capital of the Punjab. It formed, nominally, the frontier capital of the Cabul monarchy, but was really governed by certain Afghan sirdars, the brothers of Azeem Khan, the late vizier of the Afghan king. This blunder is sufficient to show the very small acquaintance which Dr. Hunter possessed of the subject at the time he undertook to enlighten the world on Indian Wahabeeism. But this is only one of the many mistakes into which he has fallen. He is evidently under the impression that the brunt of the struggle against Syud Ahmad fell upon Runjeet Sing and his armies. As a matter of fact, the Sikhs only once came into collision with Syud Ahmad; his enemies were the Afghan sirdars who ruled in Peshawur. As to the troops who are said to have flocked to his camp "from every discontented prince of

northern India," it is simply impossible to understand what Dr. Hunter means by this statement. What is northern India? With whom were these princes discontented? The fact of the matter is, that during Syud Ahmad's career, the only princes who could have flocked to his standard were the Peshawur chiefs who were engaged in fighting against him; and their lands did not form a part of India at all. Syud Ahmad was never in the least degree formidable to the Sikhs; Runjeet Sing never had occasion to use his "matchless diplomacy" against him; and the momentary occupation of the city of Peshawur was the sole important glimmer of success which shone upon the Prophet's career from first to last.\*

When we pass from the relations of the Sikhs with Syud Ahmad, to those which have obtained between the British Government and his religious descendants, we find Dr. Hunter falling into errors even more surprising, because he is here writing of facts which have occurred within the memory of numbers of people at present in India.

"On our annexation of the Punjab," writes Dr. Hunter, "the fanatic fury which had formerly spent itself upon the Sikhs was transferred to their successors. Hindoos and English were alike infidels in the eyes of the Sittana host, and as such were to be exterminated by the sword. . . . I do not propose to trace in detail the insults, inroads, and murders which led to the Frontier War of 1858. During the whole period the fanatics kept the border tribes in a state of chronic hostility to the British power. A single fact will speak volumes. Between 1850 and 1857 we were forced to send out sixteen distinct expeditions, aggregating 33,000 regular troops; and between 1850 and 1863 the numbers rose to twenty separate expeditions, aggregating 60,000 regular troops, besides irregular auxiliaries and police."

This passage, like the former, is a piece of pure romance, "all carved out of the carver's brain." "The single fact that will speak volumes" is unhappily not a fact at all, but a most ridiculous error. The number of expeditions which have been undertaken against what Mr. Hunter terms "the Sittana host" have been two; the other frontier expeditions had nothing more to do with them or with religion than with the Franco-German war; and it may be affirmed with certainty that no one possessing the smallest knowledge of our north-western frontier would have committed himself to the preposterous assertion that the insignificant and half-starved colony of Sittana could exercise a

---

\* Should any of our readers care for further particulars regarding the career of Syud Ahmad, we would refer them to an article entitled "The Afghan Tribes on our North-Western Frontier." *Westminster Review*, October, 1899.

prevailing influence along 800 miles of inaccessible mountain ranges, peopled by tribes for ever engaged in internecine war, not only against other tribes, but each within itself. We must entreat the patience of our readers while we demonstrate the impossibility of this somewhat more in detail.

The north-west frontier of our Indian empire is a vast tract of hilly country, 800 miles in length, commencing at the north-west corner of the kingdom of Cashmere, and running in a southerly direction to the confines of Scinde. Along the outer side of this frontier, and therefore beyond British territory, there dwell a number of independent tribes—some Afghans, and some Belooch—but all of them absolute barbarians, whose trade is robbery, and who will murder a man for his shirt. They never move about except armed to the teeth; and they are always at war with each other, or engaged in predatory expeditions against the villages at the foot of the hills. Each person counts up his murders, regarding them as so many acts of virtue where-with he has adorned the brief span of his existence; and revenge and retaliation are held among them to be the first of excellences. They have led this life from time immemorial; and it was not to be expected that when we took possession of the frontier they would at once relinquish their long-established habits. Rather, there was in our system of rule an encouragement to persevere. When Runjeet Sing added another province to his dominions, the sole object which he had in view was an increase of revenue. So long as he got this he was content, and never thought of interfering in the interminable civil wars carried on between tribe and tribe along the frontier. That was their business, not his. The villages were compelled to pay tribute, but in all other respects were as independent as they had ever been. The villagers, in consequence, retained all their primitive courage and activity. They were always ready to meet an attack, and repay aggression by aggression. Necessarily, when we came into possession of this frontier we could not stand quietly by and permit our subjects to carry on interminable little wars of their own, by means of raids, robberies, and assassinations. Private war was put down, and the whole frontier taken under official protection. There was no other course of action possible to us, but the inevitable result was that the villagers rapidly lost the old manliness and independence which caused them to take a glory in feats of courage and hardihood achieved in defence of their homes. At the same time, it can easily be understood that an isolated body of troops placed for defensive purposes at comparatively distant intervals along a vast extent of frontier, was a very insufficient substitute for that universal levy which any act of aggression called forth in the old

times as if by the speed of magic. A raid, consequently, through one of the countless hill passes, became a much less perilous affair than formerly. Again, the very leniency with which we treated offenders prevented our displeasure from being a cause of much dread. The Sikh government never forgot or forgave. Sooner or later, the moment of retaliation arrived, and then the punishment which fell upon the aggressor was terrific. The entire tribe would be involved in common ruin for the crime perhaps of a very few. We, on the contrary, have been anxious to chastise only the individuals directly concerned, and when a certain amount of punishment has been inflicted, our habit has been to forget and forgive all that has happened, and to treat the criminals as if they had been all along the very embodiment of order and respectability. This policy has perhaps somewhat encouraged raids upon our territory, but the raids themselves have been the prominent element in frontier life through uncounted centuries. That the Sittana settlement has had and could have nothing to do with them will be best shown by a brief account of the settlement itself.

It pleases Dr. Hunter to call the Sittana colony "the Sittana host," "the army of the Crescent," "the fanatic host," and other high-sounding names, and to credit it with a marvellous amount of religious enthusiasm. But in truth it is only a miserable little gang of outlaws hovering for ever on the verge of famine, and not even exclusively composed of Muhammadans. In 1854 a band of reformed Thugs, who were working on the road near Peshawur, fled to Sittana and found a refuge there. Robbers, murderers, and, in a word, bad characters of every religion, who made British territory too hot to hold them, emigrated to Sittana and were welcomed. And their whole conduct has been in keeping with this general character. There has been very little of religious zeal in it. After the death of Syud Ahmad, the greater part of his followers dispersed; a small section, however, settled on the bank of the Indus, and established what has since been known as the "fanatic colony of Sittana." The "fanatic fury" of which Dr. Hunter makes so much, kept itself absolutely quiet until October 1857, when it gratified at once its sacred zeal for the Muhammadan faith and its love of plunder by attacking the encampment of a British officer. A force under General Sir Sydney Cotton was sent into the hills to inflict punishment for this outrage. It penetrated to Sittana, and after a single brief skirmish took possession of the settlement and destroyed it. The colonists then retired to Mulkah, on one of the northern spurs of the Mahabun range. Their numbers, which had much decreased after Sir Sydney's expedition, gradually rose to about one thousand, which represents, in all proba-

bility, the largest aggregate to which Dr. Hunter's "army of the Crescent" ever attained. Early in June, 1863, they reoccupied Sittana and other villages, and recommenced the petty outrages which led to General Chamberlain's expedition, and the disastrous Umbeyla campaign.

This campaign furnishes a grand opportunity for Dr. Hunter's "army of the Crescent," which is, of course, the presiding spirit throughout, and, like Addison's angel,

"Pleased the Almighty's orders to perform,  
Rides on the whirlwind, and directs the storm.

Actually, it had nothing whatever to do with the disasters of that campaign. The Bonairs attacked our advanced guard unexpectedly, and brought it to a standstill. The neighbouring tribes, exulting in the momentary check of a British force, did for a time coalesce to attack it. But the coalition was transitory. It broke up in a fortnight, and the strongest proof of the small hold which the Sittana colonists have over the neighbouring tribes is found in the fact that—to quote Dr. Hunter's own words—"the Bonair tribes, on whom the rebel settlement had chiefly depended, entered into an engagement with us to burn them in their den." That circumstance alone is sufficient to refute Dr. Hunter's absurd statement that every expedition along the whole line of the frontier that we have undertaken since the conquest of the Punjab, was due to the intrigues of this wretched little band of escaped Thugs, murderers, and robbers, with possibly among them a sparse sprinkling of ignorant Muhammadan bigots. We think we have said enough to show that the "army of the Crescent" which exists beyond our frontier is not calculated to place our Indian empire in very serious jeopardy, and pass on to consider the prospects of sedition within the frontier.

There is in the English mind a vague impression that there is a subtle and peculiarly malignant poison inherent in the creed of the Prophet, which preserves *all* its votaries for ever on the verge of religious fanaticism. In accordance with this popular notion, every Indian Musalman is supposed to be always longing for a *jehad* (a religious war), and ready at any moment to commence it. The *Spectator* when commenting upon Dr. Hunter's book, appeared to accept this notion as something beyond the reach of cavil, and declared quite calmly that the fate of the British empire in India depended upon the decision of three Arabs in Mecca. Had they pronounced in favour of religious war, thirty millions of Musalmans, as a matter of course, would have risen in rebellion, with their arms, commissariat, transport train, generals, field and siege artillery, all organized according to the latest Prussian improvements; the snider would have

been of no avail, and the British empire would have sunk down in irretrievable ruin. The curious thing is, that no one ever reasons in this manner about the professors of any other religion. No one supposes that every Christian is a model of holiness and virtue because he acknowledges the authority of the text that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." Precisely the same laxity holds good in the case of the Musalman. He does not care to confront the chances of death and the hardships of war, even though in the abstract he may consider *jehad* a meritorious proceeding; this is proved by the whole tenor of his history:

"The Arabs who marched under the banners of the successors of the Prophet were (as has been already said in an article which appeared in an Indian paper\*) men habituated from infancy to a life of rapine and plunder, inured to every form of hardship, and utterly reckless of life. To these attributes was added the strong excitement of a religious creed which pandered to their most imperious passion both in this world and the next. Thus fused and welded together in one fiery torrent, they flung themselves on old and enfeebled polities already decayed by internal corruption and luxury, which collapsed at once before their headlong fury. The first burst of triumph gave them the impetus which carried their standards through Central Asia to the confines of India. But the descendants of these indomitable warriors soon lapsed into luxury and sloth. Seljuks, Kharezmians, Mongols, swept in succession over the dominions of the Caliphs, burning, destroying, and desecrating wherever they appeared, and finally putting an end to Caliphs altogether—at least in Baghdad—but no religious war on the part of the people ever attempted to stay the torrent of invasion; not that there was not religious bigotry more than enough. When the Mongols appeared before Rhe, the Shaffaites actually betrayed the city to them on condition that they would slaughter the Hanifites. Until quite recently, we were assured that the fires of fanaticism were kindled all over Central Asia, and only needed the advance of the Russians to unite the Faithful in one innumerable phalanx of resistance to the invader. But the Russian advances, occupies Samarkand, deprives the monarch of Bokhara of all claim to the status of an independent sovereign, and meditates still further encroachments. But we hear nothing of a religious war, as we certainly ought to if the general impression about the fanatical Musalman be a correct one. The truth is, that religion *per se* has never been the sole, or, if we except the first conquests of Muhammadanism, even the principal pretext for Muhammadan aggressions. The expeditions of Mahmud of Ghuznee were simply plundering forays. The expeditions of Baber were precisely the same. When in the full tide of conquest, their enemies flying before them, the Muhammadans have been ready enough to justify their cruelties by an appeal to the Koran, and the judgments of God against idolaters. But it would be exceedingly difficult to discover in history an example of any great Muhammadan rising

---

\* The Indian Observer, Oct. 21, 1871.

for the sake solely of religion, when success was impossible or even greatly improbable. There certainly *ought* to have been a religious war in Affghanistan when we invaded that country. As certainly there was nothing of the kind. In 1857 the entire thirty millions of Muhammadans *ought* to have risen against us ; as a matter of fact, among our staunchest allies were the Begum of Bhopal and the Nizam of Hyderabad, Muhammadan potentates both. And Musalman soldiers fought in our ranks with as much courage and loyalty as Sikhs or Hindoos. Transient ebullitions of passion, such as were exhibited a short time ago at Philibet and Bareilly, are removed an infinite distance from the deep and continuous enthusiasm which would be willing to sustain a conflict with the might of the British empire. The minds that could conceive and organize such an enterprise would also be the very first to recognise its insanity."

To which remarks may be added, that for the Indian Musalmans to attack the British Government in the interests of the Muhammadan faith would be to insure their immediate defeat. Such a proceeding would unite Sikhs, Rajpoots, and Mahrattas as one man upon our side ; on the principle of *divide et impera* we might almost say that we have less to fear from the fanaticism of the Muhammadan than from the attrition of those points of difference which hold him aloof from the Hindoo.

But, passing from this general question, there have been certain special influences working for years past upon the Indian Musalman which, in his case, render such an enterprise as a religious war on the British Government in the interest of barbarism (as depicted in Dr. Hunter's work) as in the last degree improbable.

The Indian Muhammadans may be classed under three heads. There is—first, the small but eminent class of those who have been powerfully affected by the spectacle of the order, progressiveness, and equitable toleration afforded to them by British administration. They eagerly avail themselves of the advantages of Western civilization, and their chief endeavour is, not to recoil back on the ferocious tenets of Kaled and his followers, but to blend the milder spirit of Christianity with the stern intolerance of the Koran ; to make the narrow dogmatism of the Prophet accommodate itself to the facts of the nineteenth century. Dr. Hunter would have his readers believe that no good Musalman can regard British supremacy with other feelings than active hatred, or at best, a sullen and melancholy acquiescence. But the Koran is no such Procrustes bed as he seems to suppose. It would be impossible to find the principle of toleration, especially with regard to Christians, more distinctly laid down than it is in parts of the Koran ; and of such passages the class of whom we are speaking make the most, and are fully



justified in so doing.\* The same more genial and charitable interpretations are conveyed by them into all the harsher dogmas of their faith; the obligation of religious war, and even the institution of slavery, have been successfully refined away by these Eastern rationalists; the houris and the wine-cups, and other sensual enjoyments promised to the devout believer, have long ago been converted into material images of spiritual realities; and the knife-like bridge balanced over the abyss of hell, which the true believer must traverse before he can enter Paradise, has become the presentation under a figure of that awful moment surrounded by vague terrors when the soul abandons its tenement of clay. These men are all known under the generic title of Wahabees; but their enlightenment and moderation would repel at once the insane proposal to plunge the country into war and bloodshed for such an impossible consummation as the re-establishment of Muhammadan supremacy. Next to the rationalizing Musalman—the Broad Church party of the Muhammadan creed—comes that very large class who adhere loosely to any creed in which they may be brought up from mere indolence and habit. To ask these men to enter upon a *jehud* against the British power would have precisely the same effect as to endeavour to induce a British Protestant merchant, engaged in business in the City, to enter in person upon a crusade to rescue the Holy Sepulchre from the grasp of the infidel. The respectable easy-going Muhammadan may occasionally grumble at the hard times on which he has fallen, but he would as soon think of cutting off his own head as of facing the volleys of the British snider from a sense of the advantages of *jehud* in a future world. The Prophet has claims on him doubtless, but then his own life is valuable also. And religious war in this country means the abandonment of wife and family, and the betaking of oneself into a distant land to live among people more savage even

---

\* Those who feel interested in the matter, and wish to become acquainted with a genuine Musalman's view of Wahabeeism, cannot do better than procure a file of this year's *Pioneer*—the leading journal of the North-West Provinces. In a series of temperate and courteous articles, Moulvie Syud Ahmad, a Muhammadan gentleman well known in England, and eminent in India for his enlightened liberality and hearty loyalty, has subjected Dr. Hunter's book to a searching criticism. These papers show, as we have said, that Dr. Hunter's knowledge of either Wahabees or Muhammadans is of the smallest, but they are also valuable as containing much information about the sect, their relations with the mountaineers among whom they reside, and with the great body of Muhammadans in India, their distinctive tenets, their literature, and many other matters which no one except an educated Muhammadan, acquainted both with his own countrymen and with the English, could have brought together. These papers, and an article on *Jehad*, which appeared in the same journal, are really valuable contributions to the literature of the subject.

than the savage hills on which they dwell; and there to remain among the pick of Indian scoundrelism, exposed to misery, disease, and hardship of every description, until the long-suffering British Government becomes at last cognizant of your existence, and despatches an expedition for the express purpose of pinning you on the point of a bayonet. Our Muhammadan fellow-subjects, even granting that they are not enthusiastically loyal, are not wholly destitute of common sense, will hardly sacrifice *en masse* the security and order of British rule, for the sake of Dr. Hunter's "fanatic host." That such is the case we may find assurance from the fact that it is admitted even by Dr. Hunter. Incidental statements may be gleaned from his book which contrast strangely with the spirit of alarm which is its ordinary tone. "Every Musalman priest," he tells us, "with a dozen acres attached to his mosque or wayside shrine, has been shrieking against the Wahabis during the past half century." "The Muhammadan landholders maintain the cause of the Mosque precisely as English landholders defend the Established Church. Any form of dissent, whether religious or political, is perilous to vested rights." "Nor indeed would a religious Jacquerie of this sort (*i.e.* Wahabeeism) find favour with the fundholding, or *with any section of the comfortable classes.*"

This is exactly what we hold; and we think that we can show, to the satisfaction of any reasonable person, that in the lower station of society the Wahabee preacher has to encounter a still more stubborn resistance. Here he is confronted by a religion monotheistic in name, but as completely idolatrous in fact as the most degraded form of Hindooism. In an article to which we have already alluded ("The Afghan Tribes on our Trans-Indus Frontier"—*Westminster Review*, Oct. 1869) we had occasion to point out the wide chasm which divides the religious faith of the Wahabee from that of the ordinary Indian Musalman. The passage is somewhat long, but we transcribe it nevertheless, as it seems to us to show conclusively the small chance there is of Wahabeeism, as depicted by Dr. Hunter, making much progress among the great mass of Muhammadans.

"Taken in their purity, no two religions could well be in more striking contrast than the Hindoo and the Musalman. The Hindoo multiplies deities in reckless profusion; the Musalman has but one. The Hindoo delights in holy places and sacred relics without number: Mecca is the one spot upon earth which, according to the teaching of the Prophet, should have any spiritual value in the mind of a Musalman. The Hindoo year is crowded with religious festivals, rites, and ceremonies of every description; the Muhammadan year contains, properly speaking, but two. The Hindoo delights in idols; the good Musalman

should hate them with his whole heart. But in India these sharp contrasts have been lost, and a number of Hindoo beliefs and practices have been incorporated with the Musalman faith and ceremonial. Such, for example, are the veneration paid to saints, which serve among the Musalmans of India for the minor deities of the Hindoo Pantheon, and the pilgrimages made to their tombs. These saints have multiplied with almost incredible rapidity. Almost every town and village in India, where Musalmans are to be found, has its tutelary saint and protector; while there are six Musalman saints in honour of whom festivals are held every year. The ceremonies on these occasions are taken entirely from the Hindoo ritual and the shrines visited by an immense concourse of people, Hindoos as well as Musalmans. Another noticeable thing in Indian Muhammadanism—plainly borrowed from the Hindoos—is the adoration paid to various apocryphal monuments and relics. There are five places in India where the print of the Prophet's foot is an object of veneration to believing thousands; the tombs of the patriarchs Seth and Job, in the shape of two great tumuli, can be visited by the devout residents of Oudh; at Cuddapah a beautiful monument was erected as a shrine in which to preserve a hair of the Prophet's beard. . . .

"But the most remarkable example of the influence of the Hindoo on the Musalman religion in India is to be found in the festival of the month of Mohurram. This festival is an institution of Shyite origin, in remembrance of the murder of Houssain on the plain of Kerbelah, and in any country but India would be regarded by the orthodox Musalman as a heretical falling away from the true faith. But in India, with the more tolerant spirit of the Hindoo, not only do Sunnite and Shyite partake in the festival with thorough good will, but they have borrowed their ceremonial—or at least the most important part of it—from the *Doorga Pooja*, which the Hindoos celebrate in the month of *Katik* (October, November), in the honour of *Doorga*, goddess of death, and wife of Siva . . .

"Against all these departures from the simplicity of the Musalman faith, Syud Ahmed set his face like a flint. His prohibitions are arranged under three heads. 1st. The innovations which have sprung from association with heretics or infidels, and with those who sin against the unity and give companions to God. These include excess of reverence, approaching to idolatry, paid to religious teachers, the ceremonies observed at tombs, and the making offerings in honour of saints. 'The vulgar,' writes Muhammad Ismail, 'think it more of a sacred duty to make long and difficult pilgrimages from all quarters to the shrines of saints than to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca.' They ask their

favour and assistance, with a belief in their independent power, which is flat blasphemy ; they burn lamps on their tombs, actually believing that this practice, which has been forbidden upon traditions of unquestionable authority, will make their prayers acceptable. These with a number of other practices are peremptorily forbidden as inconsistent with the omniscience and omnipotence of God. 2nd. The abuses which have sprung from association with Shias : such as holding Ali to be superior in dignity to the three first Caliphs who were his predecessors ; partaking with Shias in the feast of the Mohurram, and consenting to the idolatrous practices which accompany it. 3rd. The abuses which have sprung from bad and corrupt customs generally—such as the expensive ceremonies on occasions of mourning and festivity, and the prohibition of second marriages in the case of widows. The other abuses included in this class are, vainglorious reliance on the good qualities of ancestors, which is noted as the special sin of Syuds ; the having faith in soothsaying and astrology, the attending to lucky and unlucky days, the worshipping like the Hindoos, the Goddess of Small Pox, and many more too numerous to mention.”

It is evident from the above passage, that for the ordinary Indian Musalman to become a Wahabee entails an entire revolution of thought and feeling and belief. He must at one step pass from Polytheism, with the easy-going tolerance which it generates, into a Monotheism which his intellect is incapable of grasping, and the ferocity of which is alien to his disposition. And as a matter of fact he does not accomplish this surprising feat. Wahabeeism, of the seditious character set forth by Dr. Hunter, is confined to a single province of India—Eastern Bengal. We will not weary our readers with a long account of the causes of this ; but the facts are so ; and every one acquainted with India knows that the Germans are about as likely to make common cause with the French, as the Musalmans of Upper India to unite with their co-religionists of Eastern Bengal. But even in this solitary province, the evil is working out its own cure. We like to quote Dr. Hunter, whenever we can find him in agreement with us ; and he tells us “The summing up of the judges shows that the Wahabee preachers have drafted away to almost certain slaughter hundreds of deluded youths, generally under twenty, and often without the consent of their parents, from nearly every district of Eastern Bengal. That they have introduced misery and bereavement into thousands of peasant families, and created a feeling of chronic anxiety throughout the whole rural population with regard to their most promising young men.” Even here we see Dr. Hunter’s besetting sin of wild exaggeration finely exhibiting itself. *Hundreds* of youths could not bereave *thousands* of

families of the youths thus spirited away. He adds, "By far the greater portion perish by pestilence, famine, or the sword. The few who return bring back a firm conviction that they have been used as tools, and cast aside when no longer required." The maddest fanatic then, we may hope, will before long cease to play at such a very disastrous game as this. Here then in fine, is what rebellious Wahabeeism is discovered to be, when divested of the ornaments of rhetoric. "The army of the Crescent" consists of a small gang of miscellaneous scoundrelism (numbering perhaps a thousand men), badly fed and worse armed, who certainly could not resist a single company of British troops for two minutes in the open field. This formidable host has been recruited since it came into existence by some "hundreds of young men generally under the age of twenty" from the most ignorant province in Bengal, "by far the greatest part of whom perish by pestilence, famine, or the sword, and the rest return home firmly convinced that they have been taken in." There is nothing very terrible to be apprehended from rebellion producing results of this kind.

The two first chapters of Dr. Hunter's book are historical. In the third he addresses himself to the discussion, whether or not the Indian Musalman is bound in conscience to rebel against the Queen? Into this question we do not propose to enter. There is something to our mind supremely ridiculous in an English gentleman, whom we will undertake to say has never so much as read the Koran through, even in the English translation, attempting to transform himself into a Doctor of Muhammadan Theology, and pronouncing *ex cathedra* as to what an Indian Musalman is or is not bound in conscience to do. We may observe *passim*, that Dr. Hunter's theology has been declared to be as incorrect as the rest of his book;\* but what we are at present concerned

---

\* The question was discussed in a very able article which appeared in the *Pioneer* (the leading journal of the North-Western Provinces), November 23rd, and was evidently either written by, or under the immediate supervision of Sir William Muir—on such a subject, undoubtedly the greatest authority in Europe. The article itself was at once translated into Hindu, and circulated by Moulvie Syud Ahmed among the Muhammadans of that part of India; and subsequently an address signed by upwards of five hundred leading Musalmans was presented to the editor of the *Pioneer*, thanking him for this refutation of Dr. Hunter's "mischievous misrepresentations." The argument laid down in this article is briefly this. Dr. Hunter's position is, that India is no longer a *Dar ul Islam*, or country of the Faithful. Were it so, it would be the duty of every Musalman to maintain it in its position as such by armed rebellion or *jihad*. It is a *Dar ul harb*, or country of the enemy, and as such, *jihad* becomes unlawful therein, because the Moslems are protected and permitted to exercise their religious duties without let or hindrance. The *Pioneer* takes objection to this division, as not being exhaustive, and also as affixing an erroneous interpretation to the term *Dar ul harb*. *Dar ul harb*

with is the exaggerated importance which Dr. Hunter ascribes to these *fativas*, both in the past and present.

"It is scarcely possible," he writes, "to exaggerate the dangers which might have resulted had these *Fativas* been in favour of rebellion; and the mere fact of the question having been raised at all, reveals the perilous ground upon which our supremacy in India is based; for it should never be forgotten that such decisions, when opposed to the Government, have given rise to some of the most obstinate and bloody revolts that the world has seen. Even Akbar was nearly hurled from the height of his power by a decision of the Jaunpur lawyers declaring that rebellion against him was lawful. The great military revolt in Bengal followed, and from that time several of the landholders in

---

in the first place does not mean "country of the enemy," as supposed by Dr. Hunter, but "country of war." In order to make a country *Dar ul harb* there must be *positive* oppression of the Musalmans; not merely want of countenance, negative withholding of support, but absolute oppression, and obstruction in religious matters; such as impair one of "the pillars of Islam," and not merely touch the existence of Kazees, or the administration of the country through Moslem officials. Only in a country where such conditions exist is *jihad* lawful. But intermediately between the *Dar ul Islam*, and the *Dar ul harb* is the *Dar-ul-amân*, "or land of security," in which a Moslem may lawfully reside. The Prophet himself established this both by act and precept, when he sanctioned the flight of his followers during the infancy of his faith, to the Christian kingdom of Abyssinia, "a country wherein no one was wronged—a land of righteousness." The condition of the Moslems in India under British rule is precisely similar. They are absolutely free from interference with their faith; they manage the internal affairs of their community by their own law; they perform their pilgrimage, and celebrate their Feeds without let or hindrance. "A Wahabi" the *Pioneer* says in conclusion, "is not even necessarily an exclusive follower of Abdul Wahab; he may be a Hanafi, a Maliki, or a member of any other Musalman sect—and almost invariably denominates himself (so far as our observation in these Provinces has gone) as a Sunni. A Wahabi is simply a pure worshipper—a Puritan of Islam, a follower of the uncontaminated faith of the Prophet. To represent him as uniformly a secret conspirator against constituted authority, a worker in darkness, a preacher of sedition, is a libel. We could point to many men in the service of Government, than whom Government possesses no more faithful or trusted servants, who openly and fearlessly and honourably avow that they are Wahabis, and glory in the name. Nay more, these men are not only now the trusted servants of the State, but many of them were tried in the hottest fire of the Mutiny and remained faithful. Had they been preachers of *jihad*—had rebellion been of the essence of Wahabism—this could never have been. And we commend their conduct to Mr. Hunter's notice, as a complete reply, on the part of the Wahabis themselves, to the 'crucial question' suggested by him in the note to page 142 of his book." In a note (p. 130—132) of Dr. Hunter's first edition, will be found a long extract from a speech delivered in Calcutta by Shekh Ahmed Effendi Ansari, a respectable resident of Medina, bearing testimony to the same effect as that in the above passage from the *Pioneer*. Dr. Hunter on this, superciliously remarks, "The learned Shaikh had kept such good company on his travels, that he was quite oblivious to what was going on among the masses of Indian Musalmans." Dr. Hunter has never served out of the Lower Provinces, and

the Lower Provinces had to be treated as feudatories rather than as subjects."

This passage furnishes a very felicitous illustration of the wild exaggeration and pure romance in which, under the name of "history," Dr. Hunter absolutely revels through the whole of this wonderful book. "Some of the most obstinate and bloody revolts that the world has seen!" It is a pity that Dr. Hunter did not mention some of these revolts. We claim to know something of Oriental history, but we have never come across any of them in the course of our studies. With regard to the military revolt in Bengal, the decision of the Jaunpur lawyers had nothing whatever to do with it. It was occasioned solely by the endeavours of Akbar to limit the enormous peculations whereby his great military chiefs in that province were enriching themselves. The whole story of the revolt is to be found in even such a well-known book as "Elphinstone." The military revolt did not *nearly* hurl Akbar from the height of his power, and would not have done so had it been successful. All that would have followed then would have been that Bengal and Behar would have become an independent principality; Akbar would have continued as before, the undisputed sovereign of the rest of his possessions. But the most singular thing in this passage is the reasoning, that because a Muhammadan revolt "nearly hurled Akbar from the height of his power," therefore a Muhammadan revolt would have precisely the same effect upon us.

Under the Moghul administration, the Governor of a Province was also the absolute lord of a powerful army. He was nominated the commander of so many thousand men, and these troops did not belong to a single organization under the control of one central authority. They formed the army of the particular officer who commanded them; he had the power of life and death; all honour, pay, and promotion proceeded from him; and there was no appeal from his authority to that of the Emperor. This insane constitution of their military resources was, as is well known, one of the main causes of the decline of the Moghul Empire. The death of the reigning sovereign was the signal for a contest among the sons who, as Governors of Provinces, commanded large masses of troops, and were at any moment ready to take the field at the head of an army who owed no allegiance but to themselves. In the case of the Bengal revolt, that province had only just been subdued, and was still full of Akbar's victorious generals at the head of their

---

knows no more of what is "going on among the masses of Indian Musalmans," than among the mountains of the moon. No European does. We must accept the testimony of leading Musalmans as to the feelings of their co-religionists, or construct them as Dr. Hunter seems to do, from our inner consciousness. We prefer the former method.

various commands. The Emperor was at a distance ; and long before he or his troops could arrive at the scene of action, thirty thousand of his best cavalry were arrayed in battle against him. Such things were possible then. The materials for a revolt were always kept ready prepared. It needed but an accidental spark to fall among them to produce the explosion. But in what manner a religious *Fativa* could produce an insurrection now, calculated to "hurl the British Government from the height of its power," we should have liked Dr. Hunter to explain. We set aside the question that in order to attempt such an insurrection, armies, generals, and artillery are wanting ; that the snider and the breech-loading cannon are perhaps as powerful to suppress a revolt, as a *Fativa* to excite one. Apart from these, as against the Muhammadan fanatic, our supremacy in India is based upon the hearty loyalty of the entire Hindoo population, who would certainly prefer in such a contingency the Government of the Queen to the Government of the Koran. This cannot be denied, even on the ground that Dr. Hunter has taken up—that the Indian Musalman must of necessity be tacitly disloyal to the British Government. But we recognise no such necessity ; and know moreover from personal knowledge, that both in the ranks of the Army and in the Civil Service, many of the most loyal and zealous servants of the Queen are Muhammadans. Dr. Hunter himself is an involuntary witness of this in the story he tells (chap. ii. page 85), of the stanch fidelity to Government of Guzan Khan, a Punjabee sergeant of Mounted Police. Does he suppose Guzan Khan to be a solitary instance—like Abdiel among the angels—"among the faithless, faithful only he?" Nay, the very history of Wahabeeism, as told by Dr. Hunter, establishes the substantial loyalty of the Muhammadans. For thirty years have the Patna Caliphs been sending out to preach sedition, "swarms of preachers, every one of whom is carefully nurtured in treason," and the only subjects they have worked up to the point of rebellion have been some "hundreds of youths generally under the age of twenty," living amid the swamps of Eastern Bengal.

But Dr. Hunter is not content with asserting that until the publication of his theological arguments, which he believes "will give peace to thousands of devout men," every good Musalman could at best give only "a cold acquiescence to our rule ;" he declares also that they have good cause for this unpromising attitude quite apart from religious scruples.

"They accuse us," he says, "of having closed every honorable walk of life to professors of their creed. They accuse us of having introduced a system of education which leaves their whole community unprovided for, and which has landed it in contempt and beggary.



They accuse us of having brought misery into thousands of families by abolishing their law officers who gave the sanction of religion to the marriage tie, and who from time immemorial had been the depositaries and administrators of the domestic law of Islam. They accuse us of imperilling their souls by denying them the means of performing the duties of their faith. Above all, they charge us with deliberate malversation of their religious foundations, and with misappropriation on the largest scale of their educational funds . . . . . They declare that we, who obtained our footing in Bengal as the servants of a Muhammadan Empire, have shown no pity in the time of our triumph, and with the insolence of upstarts have trodden our former masters into the mire. In a word, the Indian Musalmans arraign the British Government for its want of sympathy, for its want of magnanimity, for its mean malversation of their funds, and for great public wrongs spread over a period of one hundred years."

Either Dr. Hunter has invented this formidable catalogue of injuries out of his own creative brain, or as it is more charitable to suppose, he has met at last one Musalman who has assured him that such are the charges which his co-religionists bring against the British Government. We confess, on the latter supposition, we should much like to make the acquaintance of the Musalman who delivered himself of this extraordinary piece of rodomontade. He was evidently a wag, and was making fun of Dr. Hunter's ignorance. The first thing in the matter which puzzles us is,—Who are these Indian Musalmans who have been so dreadfully aggrieved with the "upstart insolence" of the British Government? They cannot be the Muhammadans of the Punjab and the Trans-Indus frontier, because in the first place we have not ruled over them for one hundred years, and in the second place because we delivered them within the memory of living men from the iron tyranny of the Sikh; and whatever be the deficiencies of British rule, it must be a perfect paradise compared with the purgatory in which they were tortured. They cannot be the Muhammadans of the North-West Provinces, for when we came into possession of that part of India, the Musalman population was at the lowest point of depression—the king of Delhi blind, poverty-stricken, destitute almost of his daily food, and the whole country groaning beneath the exactions of Scindiah and the weight of his armies. Besides, so far from the Muhammadans of the North-West being reduced to beggary and contempt, or cut off from every honourable career, we find them greedily availing themselves of the education offered to them by the British Government, and taking their relative numbers into consideration, the Musalmans hold more than their fair proportion of the highest offices under Government. They cannot be the Muhammadans of Central India, for long before we came into

possession of those countries, every trace of Muhammadan supremacy had been effaced ; and the independent kingdoms of Hyderabad, Tonk, and Bhopal, which still survive, owe their existence to the friendship and protection of the British Government. The popular notion that we replaced the Muhammadan supremacy is a gross blunder. But for our intervention, the Sikh and the Mahratta would have parcelled out the entire continent between them. We stood in the gap, and preserved a remnant of the Musalman community from the vengeance about to fall on them. Neither can Dr. Hunter's typical Muhammadan be a soldier of our native army ; for turning to the Army List, we find that in the nineteen regiments of cavalry, among the Bahadoors and Sirdar Bahadoors (the highest distinction which the native officer can attain to), there are fourteen Musalmans and only six Hindoos. Thus, by this process of elimination, we gradually arrive at the fact, that when Dr. Hunter speaks of the "Indian Muhammadans" doing this and that, it is only his large way of saying that a Musalman of Bengal proper, might, if given to grandiloquence, and of a grumbling disposition, have adduced the catalogue of complaints which we have quoted. The greater part of these complaints appear to us frivolous and absurd ; and may, in fact, be said to amount to one. The Bengal Musalman complains bitterly that the world cannot be held fixed down in one place. A hundred years ago, all the fat things belonged to the Muhammadan, who gives nothing in return, except the profession of the Prophet's creed. Now, alas ! quite other qualifications are required. A doctor, if he wants to live by his profession, must know something of medicine ; a legal practitioner must be acquainted with the law ; and the Musalman resents the change as an insult and an injury. We fear the most beneficent government cannot avail to remedy this peculiarity in the constitution of the universe. If the Bengal Musalman refuses to march with the times, he must suffer the consequences ; the British Government is powerless to help him. We cannot conceive of any course of action more impolitic than that suggested by Dr. Hunter—to give in to these unreasonable complaints, and establish state-aided schools throughout the Lower Provinces to instruct the youthful Musalman in the teaching of the Koran. It would be a crying injustice to compel the Hindoo *volens volens* to contribute towards the religious education of the Muhammadan ; and most absurd in us, who wish to emancipate the whole continent from the trammels of effete religions, deliberately to run counter to this end, and apply ourselves to the systematic cultivation of Muhammadan bigotry. For there can be no doubt as to the kind of faith that would be taught in Dr. Hunter's deno-

minational schools. It would, moreover, be but a cruel kindness to the Muhammadan to rivet him more closely than he is at present in the narrow yoke of his religion. Equal-handed justice the Muhammadan has a right to demand at the hands of the British Government, and this we maintain he gets; but the British Government is not an Omnipotent Being that it can cause the sun to go back fifteen degrees on the sun-dial of Abaz, or restore again the "good old times" when the Muhammadan was the lord of the land, and the Hindoo, like the French peasant of monarchical France, "taillable et corvéable à merci et miséricorde."

The one important matter brought forward by Dr. Hunter in this chapter, is the charge against the British Government of misappropriating Muhammadan endowments. Here, as elsewhere, Dr. Hunter has in our judgment fallen altogether into error; but our space will not permit us to discuss the subject. These who wish to see the other side of the question, will find the whole matter investigated, and Dr. Hunter's charges (as we hold) completely rebutted in the *Calcutta Review*, October, 1871, and the *Indian Observer*, October 28, 1871.

Our friend then, the aggrieved Bengali Musalman, when compelled to forego his ornate style and talk plain English, is obliged also to limit his injuries, in the main, to three. 1st. That in order to become a legal practitioner or a doctor, the Bengali Musalman must know something of law and physic—conditions so abhorrent to his mind that he prefers to abandon those professions altogether. 2nd. That the British Government has not taxed the Hindoo community in order to furnish him (the Musalman) with a religious education. 3rd. That the number of Hindoos in the Lower Provinces being greatly in excess of that of the Mohammadans, there is also a proportionate excess of Hindoos over Musalmans in Government employ.\* These are the three grains of wheat which remain when the superabundant chaff of Dr. Hunter's book has been winnowed away, and it is manifest that to redress such grievances as these the Government is powerless. We must legislate for the entire population of India, and not for the Muhammadan portion of it.

---

\* A few lines may be added on the subject of kazees. These functionaries were unwittingly destroyed by an Act which when passed was not intended to affect them. Dr. Hunter has fallen into error when he speaks of the kazees as conferring "the sanction of religion on the marriage tie." The office of priest in this sense is unknown to the Muhammadan religion. A marriage is valid and complete by a simple declaration in the presence of two Muhammadan witnesses. The kazees acted as registrars of marriages, and their abolition has undoubtedly been the cause of much inconvenience to the Musalman community. We think it would be good policy to restore them.

In conclusion we must observe that the smallest consideration would be sufficient to convince any sensible man that no single European can possibly know what are the thoughts and feelings of thirty millions of people, scattered over a vast continent like India, and destitute even of a common language. There cannot in this country, be so much as an approach to such knowledge, because of the almost total absence of any really intimate intercourse between the Englishman and the native of the country. But ignoring this, the English public allow any one—a Dr. Hunter or the *Times* special correspondent—to lead them to all manner of sweeping conclusions, without pausing a moment to consider if the person who has frightened them is entitled to speak on the subject at all. Dr. Hunter is a writer of great ability; but his book on the Indian Musalmans is one gigantic blunder from beginning to end, and the best thing its author could do would be to let it fall out of print and be forgotten as speedily as possible. Next to Dr. Hunter, the most formidable Indian potentate appears to be the *Times* special correspondent. This mysterious personage is well known in India, and any one less in a position to pass judgment on the Musalman or any other Indian difficulty, it would be almost impossible to discover. If English people wish to form a correct judgment upon Indian politics, they must read the Indian press. On this very question of the *Indian Musalmans*, any one who had been in the habit of taking in the *Calcutta Review*, the *Pioneer*, and the *Indian Observer*, would have learned, as no writer in England has pointed out, the causelessness of the outcry.

P.S.—This paper, as our readers will have perceived, was written before the event which put so sad and sudden a termination to Lord Mayo's career. That event, however, even allowing it to possess a political signification, would not enhance the importance of the Wahabee movement. Assassination, indeed, is a sign of weakness. Acts of this kind it is, of course, within the power of Wahabee fanaticism to commit; but deplorable as they are on every account, they do not endanger the stability of British rule. The occurrence, therefore, has not induced us to modify any of the opinions expressed in the foregoing pages.

At present, moreover, there is nothing to show that the act arose out of anything deeper than the sanguinary impulses of an Afghan savage. The murderer was not even a British subject, but a man already convicted of blood-shedding, and a member of a tribe—the Afreedees—distinguished, even among the barbarous mountaineers that encircle our north-western frontier, for their in-

difference to taking life. General Nicholson once asked a child belonging to one of these frontier tribes, if he knew it was wrong to kill men. Yes, he knew it was wrong to kill with a knife or sword. Why? *Because the blood left marks.* The whole conduct of life as observed beyond our frontier is compressed into that one remark; and this disregard for the life of others does breed an almost equal indifference for their own. An Afreede would not, in all probability, have even heard of Wahabeeism; but the flimsiest pretext—any fancied injustice in the execution of prison discipline—would have afforded abundant pretext for the murder of Lord Mayo. There is no need to look deeper. “Why have you killed your brother?” asked General Nicholson of one of these wild frontier men. “I saw a fowl killed last night, and the sight of blood put the devil into me.”

The questions that will probably be asked, and which will be more difficult to answer, are—How was it that a murderer of this description was permitted to get off with transportation instead of being hanged out of hand? And how, having been transported, he was permitted to roam about late at night, armed with a long knife?

---

## ART. V.—CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY AND MODERN SCEPTICISM.

*Christian Theology and Modern Scepticism.* By the DUKE OF SOMERSET. London: 1872.

THE writer of a review which has lately appeared in the *Times* upon a book by the Duke of Somerset, called “Christian Theology and Modern Scepticism,” gives a direct challenge which cannot be too soon taken up. He denies the prevalence of unbelief among our best-educated classes, and he laughs at the limited manifestation of it, which he admits, as a state of mind lightly fostered to the peril of its adopters, and properly to be dismissed with a jeer.

A nervous little giggle is among the best known signs of suppressed anxiety; and the uneasy banter of an ecclesiastic as he recoils from thrusts which he knows not how to parry, is a somewhat fatuous as well as contemptible style of fence. It has, moreover, this special disadvantage, that it can be instantly met by a renewed demand for seriousness, and by the imperious proposal of questions which involve crucial replies.

With the question of the prevalence or rarity of scepticism it is not so easy to deal. It is the minority only that are cultivated,

and it is the cultivated only who can be sceptical in the true sense of the term. The will of the majority, though it be the will of the meaner, is very strong; stronger, too, for persecution than anything else. It is intelligible, therefore, that the social pressure against unbelief should have been so great that sceptics have usually been known only to themselves and to each other. Men have had so much to lose by the divulgence of disbelief that they have concealed it even from friends with whom sympathy of view might have disposed them to be open. It may be said, therefore, that the sceptics of England have existed as the units of a secret society, without association, unknown even to each other, save through that unsystematic and intermittent freemasonry which is evoked during a country walk, or over a *tête-à-tête* cigar.

For all this they have been very many, and may be called numerous, even when confronted with the unemancipated masses with whom they are to be compared. Nor are their numbers any the less a fact because, so long as they cannot well be marshalled in open day, interested writers and talkers may affect to ignore them. There is wisdom in such affectation. It is wise, no doubt, to make us believe that we are few. So long as that impression can be maintained it will press upon us as a fear. It will hinder that self-announcement of individual after individual which will in the end teach us our numbers and our strength, and give us that coherence and that confidence which will enable us to lay open hands on our comfort and our liberty.

The reluctance to avow himself which has hitherto been the common weakness of the sceptic, is at once intelligible and venial. It is not sufficiently remembered by most people that clever and cultivated men usually differ from the masses in little else than their cleverness and cultivation. Like their fellows, they have otherwise the ordinary tastes of their generation. Professional advancement, marriage, affectionate intercourse with kindred, a good house, works of art, travel, a salmon river, a yacht, or a little shooting, even fine wine and well-bred horses—in short, all the successes of labour and delights of leisure—are sweet to them as to others; and there is no doubt that up to a period, which even now perhaps is unexhausted, the realization of these good things by any one not in the happy position of the Duke of Somerset would have been seriously jeopardized by the avowal of advanced religious opinions. It may be hoped that we are passing out of this epoch of pressure, which is the last phase of persecution, on the one hand, and out of this timidity, which is certainly not on a par with the nobility of martyrdom, on the other. The sooner the better for the credit of both sides, and for the chance of their absorption, either onwards into the happi-

ness of a common emancipation, or back again into the refusion of a common belief. But anyhow, until the day comes when everybody can and dare avow himself, the question "How many sceptics are there?" must be allowed to rest. Discussion will not help us to the answer; we must wait till we can count heads. Perhaps this declaration of a Duke may hasten matters; it has been frankly and formally made, with the gravest and most generous intent, and can hardly fail to bear the fruit it promises, any more than to receive the thanks which it undoubtedly deserves.

But now for the other point raised, and as we said at first, treated as a joke by the *Times* reviewer. What is the character of modern scepticism? Is it a position lightly taken up, and to be dismissed as unimportant even to laughter? In this generation there has been more than one elaborate literary attack against the old creeds, and more than one manifesto made in support of them. But so far as we can remember, the argumentation has invariably been all on the side of the attack. We do not mean to say that the orthodox party have had no reply to make, we only say that they have not made one. Their commonest method has been to turn off the affair with a sneer, as who should say, "Why, these are the old fallacies that have been refuted again and again since the days of Origen or before them!" Now surely it is always worth while to defend an important fortress against attack, however often renewed. Of what use is it to say, "We have repulsed you once; we shall not trouble ourselves again; you have had your original beating, consider it repeated." Why cannot a satisfactory refutation—if there be one—be given authoritatively, in modern language, to the staple objections which weigh so heavily against Christianity? To give a specimen of what is wanted, we will state in outline the story of the creation of man, his fall, and his atonement with God, as we conceive it to have been taught to us; then let some one come forward and defend it.

God was in the beginning as he is still, omnipotent, omnibenevolent, omniscient, prescient. He said, "I will create a being whom I shall call man. I could create him, if I so wished, not only perfect, but free from all risk of imperfection to come. But I shall not do this. I shall create him with a faculty for disobeying Me, which will be a flaw in him. I know beforehand that he will exercise this faculty, and when he does I will consign him to endless misery and perdition." The creation so resolved upon was achieved, and the first man yielding to an impulse engendered of the faculty thus advisedly implanted in him by his Creator, committed the foreseen and fore-condemned act. His maker—his prescient and omni-benevolent maker—

exacted the penalty. Then, severing himself, as it were for the moment, and casting himself athwart the will of his Father, God's own Son, who had of course no share whatever in man's fault, came forward and said, "Do not damn him, oh my Father, damn me in his stead." The Father accepted this substitution of his own innocent and only Son, and consented to forego the punishment of the actual delinquent.

Now, to put aside all sensations of its horror, is not this an absolutely incomprehensible, and self-contradictory tale? Either God was obliged to make man as he did, and then was not omnipotent, or he elected to make him as he did, being omnipotent, and then he was not omni-benevolent; or else he did not expect him to fall, and then he was not prescient—which is it to be? Again, if he made him fit to fall, and knew that he would fall, the fall was a part of his purpose, and the enactment of the penalty can only be taken to have sprung from a love of pain. But the sequel, in the substitution of his only and well-beloved Son, who was innocent under every aspect, puts, as it were, a coping-stone upon the underbuilding of impossibilities. Of it we prefer to say nothing, lest we should be tempted to record our estimate of it in terms which would wound, more than we care to wound them, the feelings of large masses of sensitive and well-intentioned persons.

Thus appears to so many of us that we are worth attention, to such of us that we are worth reclamation, the cardinal doctrine of Christianity. We have chosen it to state it, because, if it be abandoned, the other dogmata and facts of the creed can be easily dealt with. It is either proveable or it is not; it is either probable or it is not; it is either comprehensible or it is not. Its parts are either reconcileable or they are not—or, to put the alternative more strongly—they are one by one, and taken together, immoral, incongruous, and utterly repulsive to the noblest element in the nobler sort of men, the mind. On the hypothesis that there be a God, the magnificent projector, protector, and lord of this universe of Matter, more palpable if less consummate in its glory than himself, who was it, asks the sceptic, who made my mind to be the noblest part of me, and taught me to judge it to be the noblest? Was it not God himself? Can I think of him with aught else than it? Or can it think of him otherwise than by its own laws—the laws which He has limited and arranged? And can it then really be that He has revealed himself to me in a ghastly phantasmagoria upon which that mind, so working as he has made it to work, and which he has given me for my sanction and guidance, can pass but one verdict? Give me demonstration of this, and I will acknowledge it; shattered, wretched, confounded, in despair,



though I shall be, I will acknowledge it. But not till then will I for a cruel fable surrender my hopeful passion for the knowledge of my Maker, whoever he may be ; my filial yearnings for my unknown Father ; my dreams of the great unimaginable origin ; my sightless, ignorant, but undebased efforts to picture and to worship the unknown but the true Most High.

Having thus stated the one problem which it is the intention of this article to propound, let us now proceed to examine certain of the ordinary rejoinders by which professors of Christianity elude dilemmas like those to which the doctrine of the atonement exposes them. They are apt first to insist on the incomprehensible nature of God, and then upon Faith as the faculty proper for the reception of that idea along with all the fabrications which they choose to build upon it. Now, two things may be meant by the words "the incomprehensible nature of God." It is one thing to assert that something which is essentially finite cannot comprehend something else which is essentially infinite. For example—my vision is limited ; I cannot comprehend what it is to have unlimited vision. I only know a very small part of things that have happened ; I cannot realize, therefore, a complete knowledge of the past ; still less can I imagine such a faculty as an absolute familiarity with the future. My powers are small ; I cannot conceive omnipotence. My structure is smaller even than my powers, and occupies a mere speck in space ; to me ubiquity is unintelligible. My one known and palpable form of existence had a beginning and will have an end ; the idea of eternity that will never end is unframeable, while that of an eternity that had no beginning is, if pursued long enough, absolutely bewildering. In this sense the nominal attributes, for they are nothing more, conventionally assigned to God, are one and all incomprehensible, and the Being of whom they are predicated incomprehensible also. And in this limited use of the term, the incomprehensibility of God, every Theist would concur. But such concurrence would furnish the apologists of Christianity with no materials for rejoinder. For the Christian's use of the word goes much beyond this. If he carried it no further it would do him no service. With him incomprehensibility means not only that which transcends the limits within which man's reason acts, but also that which contradicts the laws under which it acts. It is this extension of the term which we repudiate, and it is in consequence of this that we repudiate the proposition in which it is employed. We deny that we ought to expect that a revelation of God should affront our reason. So long as he be unrevealed, indeed, the attempt to imagine him may well be expected to perplex us ; because, if he have not revealed himself he may be taken to have withheld

himself by design, and by design to have omitted to fit our faculties for his recognition or discovery. But on the hypothesis that he all along intended to reveal and has actually revealed himself to us, is it conceivable that he should have so constructed the only faculty by which we should know him that it should adjudge his description of himself to be that of his Arch-opposite? If here we were to be answered, "No, it is not conceivable that he should have done this, but the ways of God are inconceivable," we should reply, "Well, they are, indeed; hopelessly so; and we shall reluctantly give up all attempts to conceive them."

To what has hitherto been urged the Christian would probably reply—"So long as you will insist on regarding your mind as your only faculty, you will remain, no doubt, in this position. But you have another, which you will not use—the faculty of faith. With this you would see clearly. You are like Lord Nelson at Copenhagen, who purposely put his telescope to his blind eye, and then flung the instrument away with an oath because he could not see the Admiral's signal. If you would come to acknowledge your mind as an improper instrument for the investigation and acceptance of mysteries, and turn to the problem of their existence in a spirit of faith and prayer, all would be easy and clear." Possibly. But faith as a faculty, or an operation of man's nature, requires definition. What is faith? The question is asked at the risk of an obvious allusion to Pontius Pilate. It is not an operation of the mind at all, in any scientific sense of the words. Speaking popularly, it might be called a faulty operation of the mind, by which deductions are made without, or in contradiction of proper premisses. But it is in practice an operation of the will against the intellect, and what right has the will to oppose the intellect? Or, putting that question aside, it is plain that faith begins to act after the mind has been silenced. What then limits faith? The unrestricted, senseless, arbitrary will? What checks its license, or guides its vagaries? How are faiths, if we may be permitted the plural, tested? In that reluctant vacillating whisper, did we catch the words, "by reason"? Impossible! If faith were tested by reason, then faith would become a parenthesis, an interpolation between two paragraphs of mind. The complete dealing between a man and a creed would then be tripartite. First would come its rejection on the ground of its incompatibility with reason; secondly, its acceptance by faith during a suppression of reason; thirdly, an investigation of the particular act of faith—that is, of the accuracy of its direction at the moment, that is again, of the worthiness of the thing accepted by it: and this would be a mere renewal of the first part of the operation, and could, the subject matter being identical, only end in the same way. So again we may

ask, how faiths are tested? What makes one to differ from another? We do not mean in speciality of form, but in worth of matter. What makes one creed to seem true and another false? It cannot be the relative probability or improbability of their facts, for all at least contain much that is improbable, and even Christians admit that, were it not for faith, the retention of their own mysteries would be impossible. Brahminism contains much that is rationally inconceivable, so does Christianity; what then makes Christianity more receivable than Brahminism? One might go farther even than believers on their own hypothesis. For if creeds—that is to say, the various subject matters of faith—be histories and theories of the operations of an incomprehensible God—incomprehensible to the extent of contradicting, not merely of transcending our notions of possibility—why cannot the creeds of the world, however conflicting, be all true together? One says that God made man at one epoch, another that he made him earlier or later; one that man was made perfect and fell, another that he was made imperfect and has improved; one that a single atonement was made once and for all in a certain shape, on certain conditions, and at a certain epoch; another, that it was made in a person, by a method, under conditions, and at a time and place all wholly different. A third, perhaps, makes no mention of any atonement at all. And yet they all claim alike to be the express and complete word of God. However, if we are to expect beforehand that all we hear of God shall be incomprehensible and possibly contradictory, why may we not hold all these at once? Why not admit, in faith, that there was and was also not a fall; that there was and was not a repetition of the atonement, and still not lose sight of the co-existent truth that there was no atonement at all? Herein to its professors is the danger of this idea of faith. Herein to us who are not its professors is its absurdity. The true fact is, that there is no such thing as faith. Regarded as an asserted faculty of man it may be pronounced non-existent. As a linguistic term, it is a compendious and pretty synonym for blind submission, or for obstinate or careless acquiescence. As an act, it is an acceptance of the useful or the comfortable in some, an avoidance of the terrible or a clutching at the appetizing in others, without any reference whatever to the intrinsic merit that underlies the formulæ. As to the expositors of creeds, they practically say to their competitors, "Ours is better than yours because the evidence in its favour is better." And thus for them, as for us, the contention becomes a matter for reason after all, and one finds oneself back at the old starting-point, which is this: stories of revelation must be judged by mind—by the only means, in fact, placed by God at man's disposal. How

does the Hebrew narrative of the creation and the fall, with its Christian corollary of the atonement, fare when submitted to this adjudication?

Another position sometimes taken up, and with which we feel inclined to deal, is something like this. What right have you to assert that God is omnipotent, or omniscient to prescience, or omnibenevolent? There is more in this retort than appears to those who advance it. We have certainly no right to predicate illimitability, or indeed anything else, of a Being of whom we know nothing. But we are perfectly justified when we say that God, if he exist, either does possess all these attributes or he does not. If he possess them, then the theory of the atonement, with its consequent Christianity, is, as we have shown, impossible by any test we can bring to bear on the question of their mutual compatibility. But if he be taken to lack all or any one of these attributes, then the case with the orthodox belief is indeed different, but it is very bad. For while without doubt he would be entirely unworshipable if he failed in all the qualities in question, he would be scarcely less so if he failed in one. For, granted that he were not omnibenevolent, we could understand his fancy for damning three-fourths of all mankind, and it would be a hopeless task to propitiate him either by prayer or by vain efforts at well-living. So, if he were not omnipotent, he might indeed be well-intentioned, but some external force might then be too much for him, as the Fates were for Zeus in the Grecian Theogony. Nor, if they are to harmonize with the Christian account, could omnibenevolence and prescience co-exist any better without omnipotence than with it; for, omnipotent or not, he was still the Creator, and being fully forewarned by his prescience of the catastrophe to ensue on his act of creation, he might, had he been benevolent, have let creation alone. But, say some, when driven to the straits of such a suggestion, he may be perfectible. Possibly; but when he became perfect he would see the necessity of overlooking anterior imperfections in others which were subordinate to and consequent upon his own.

Another position assumed by a large and well-meaning class of theologians is that evil is a secondary form or cause of good in the hands of the Creator. That it is the transitional state through which he intends to bring and will bring all to a good end. But this is an unsatisfactory apology and may be dismissed with a word. Evil is evil while it lasts, and the responsibility of its existence at all rests with him who elected to employ it even for a time. He had good at his disposal, why not employ that? There is a story told of a certain shipowner who, while boarding one of his ships in the port of London, fell into the

asphyxiating water of the dock. He was promptly pulled out, and the proper restoratives were successfully applied. His friends who were present suggested that his recovery was providential, but the old gentleman referred them with some force to his antecedent immersion.

It was suggested by the Reviewer to whose performance reference has been already made, that in all probability the Duke of Somerset, in common with others who abandon Christianity for Theism, had not considered that in asserting the existence of a God at all he was committing the same fault as that with which he charged the supporters of revelation. The same class of fault, no doubt; *mais il y a des degrés*. It is surely somewhat more simple, and it is certainly less audacious, to assert the unprovable existence of a Personal Author of the Material Universe, than first to assert that much, and afterwards to go on to make many further and more complex, and to say the least of them, equally unprovable assertions as to how, when, where, and for what purposes, he has manifested himself to mankind. Besides, there are Theisms and Theisms. There is the Theism of men who, having extricated themselves from the slough of systematic theology, halt and say, "We have done much and are weary; moreover, we have now come to the end of our certainties, and shall not proceed any further till we are assured of the feasibility and accuracy of the onward route. With such men Theism is a caravanserai of thought. It may or may not also prove to be thought's goal, but at present it is occupied only as a resting-place. In any event it will be perfectly logical for them hereafter to look back on their intermediate position, and to say, "We started as Theists because we were Christians; the time came when we had made up our minds against Christianity, whilst we had not made them up in favour of Atheism; we were then Theists still, and properly called ourselves so. We were not bound to abandon the name till we were convinced of the propriety of its abandonment." This may be called Negative Theism, and whether it prove transitional or not in the experience of an individual, it is still logical. In the present state of our scientific knowledge it may be safely said that to assert the existence of God as a positive fact would be illogical in kind as Christianity is, though not to the same degree. But on the other hand, it is plain that if even a moderate exercise of circumspection, caution, and clear thought be intellectually meritorious, then pure Theism, even if positive, must be a far more venial mental weakness than orthodox Christianity.

What has just now been said must be read with a secondary meaning as an apology for Theism made to those more advanced thinkers who are apt to look back upon the intermediate stages

of scepticism with little less impatience than they do upon Christians. Its primary intention as a rejoinder to certain controversialists, whose best argument is only an uncandid claim of cousinship in superstition, is far less important; for it makes nothing whatever in favour of the reception of elaborate dogmata to show that the little which is received by the more cautious is proportionately as unwarranted as the much that is swallowed by the most reckless; but it is a matter of keen import that a sympathy and a solidarity should be established between those who have started on the right road, and those who feel that they have arrived at its goal. Men of extreme, and by extreme are here meant finished, convictions are somewhat too apt to refuse fellowship or countenance to what is inchoate or imperfect. They are prone to mistake incompleteness for compromise. They confound temporary exhaustion with some cause or other fundamentally unsatisfactory. This is to be uncharitable, hasty, brusque, exclusive; to be all or any of which is to be unwise. Some minds move more slowly over difficulties, some hearts pant longer before dangers than do others. The retrospect of their own struggles might surely teach the most victorious that the campaign of self-emancipation is seldom won in a single battle, and that there is a tendency, if not a necessity, oftentimes to bivouac upon the field. Nine out of ten out of the multiplicity of half-way creeds are due not to any positive mental divergencies, but to variations in courage or in mental speed. A failure in the bravest and strongest to recognise this has done much to impede the religious progress of English society. They have held themselves aloof in an isolation contemptuous, uncaring, surly. They have refused to go out into the highways and hedges and compel men to come in. The invitations of the orthodox of every shade towards retrogression have been far more sedulously and generously extended, and the consequence is that thousands who might once have been made guests at the feasts of reason and freedom now permanently sup nonsense with the fettered and the mean.

There are several first-class histories of revelation competing for acceptance in the world. These are the Brahmin, the Buddhist, the Jewish, the Christian, and the Mahomedan. Let us imagine a man of full age and well-developed mental faculties who had become a Theist without having had any such theological creed presented to his notice. He is on his appearance immediately beset by five propagandists all equally earnest, and all equally ready to acknowledge that he has hitherto done homage to the true God without having seen his face; all, moreover, equally bent, like St. Paul upon Mars' Hill, upon making him genuinely acquainted with the object of his devotion. "Whom thou

hast ignorantly worshipped, him declare I unto you," is the common cry of the five. Cautious and self-possessed, the spectator first compares the externals of the creeds. He notices that the Brahmin is perhaps the oldest, and is certainly the most localized; the Buddhist next in age perhaps, and next in localization; that the source of both of these two is prehistoric, and the testimony therefore on which they are based is alike beyond exposure and corroboration. He sees that Judaism is also practically of prehistoric though not altogether fathomless origin. He notices too that Christianity and Mahomedanism both had their beginning not only in times eminently historical but in localities geographically contiguous to races peculiarly given to the record of events. Numerically considered, he is disposed to place the adherents of all pretty much upon an equality. At all events there is no such difference for or against any one of the five as to constitute a supreme recommendation or a hopeless drawback. The territorial diffusion of Christianity and Judaism he would be disposed to ascribe in a great measure to the accidents and necessities of commercial vagrancy—that of Mahomedanism to the nomad character and former love of conquest of the Arab race. With a half-settled reservation as to Mahomedanism, he would perhaps suggest to himself that the relative implicitness of the belief accorded to each creed within its own geographical limits was in proportion to its relative antiquity. That Scepticism, for example, was more widely spread and more definitely established among Christians and less among Hindoos than among Jews, Buddhists, or Mussulmen. He would weigh this, however, against the fact that Christianity was professed by the most enlightened peoples. He would say, "The newest out of four of these five creeds is the best associated, but the oldest is the best believed." He would compare the moral theories attached to all, and find that, as theories, no one had an overwhelming superiority over the others, though perhaps that promulgated by Judaism was the narrowest and lowest of all. Finding that their accessories only distracted him, he would turn to the creeds themselves; they would one and all present him with many improbabilities, many discrepancies. Much, however, that would affront him, and that he would deem at first most monstrous, he would end by rating at its proper symbolic value. Amongst such things would be the story that the Khoran was written with a pen made from a quill plucked from the wing of the angel Gabriel, the story of the egg of Brahma, and the still more palpable group of Christian symbols, which he would probably mistake for a myth, to the effect that the union of a human virgin and a dove had produced a lamb. But long after all such things had found their proper level in his mind, much would remain in each case

presented to him that would be revolting to his reason—though nothing perhaps more so than that story of the creation, fall, and atonement of man which has been given above. But, fare the comparison there as it might, he would meet with but one defence for all their improbabilities from all the five professors alike. “These things do affront the reason,” they would all say, “we know it; but you must receive them all the same. Faith is the proper faculty for their reception. They must be true, because they are stated actually or inferentially in sacred writings, dictated by God himself and handed down intact since their dictation.” So each of his own creed, repudiating the right of any of his four compeers to say as much for his own. Now the accessories of all being, as we have said, distracting, and the creeds themselves being put forward upon exactly the same ground, and that ground being one that is manifestly unassailable if once admitted as arguable, but equally open to adoption by any one of the five, which of them ought he to choose? “Mine,” cries first the Brahmin, “although I cannot prove it, because it is the oldest, and I could show you that it is the origin of all the other four.” “Mine, though I cannot prove it,” breaks in the Hebrew; “see how near it is to Theism; it does no more than give God’s sanction to what is your own belief at this moment. It does not enlarge your theology. As to Christianity, it is nothing but a heresy of ours.” “Mine, though I cannot prove it,” urges the Mussulman, “for mine *is* pure Theism, and any improbabilities in it are but accessories after all. The mantle is of pure dye, whatever the fringe may be. Improbability is of the essence of the others.” “Mine, although I will not prove it—I could if I chose,” lastly echoes the Christian; “see what it has done for the world!” This last appeal would probably incline our student somewhat towards the last speaker, as the last feather turns the balance; but his adhesion would only go to this length, “Yours, if you will prove it”—and so say we.

It is not much to be wondered at that the more clear-sighted theologians, from the days of King David downwards, should have felt the necessity of discrediting the mind. “Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes,” “Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast thou perfected praise,” are cries meet for the mouths of dogmatists, not of one age but of all time. The mind is the natural enemy of the priest, and the priest has ever known as much. Thought is fatal to that which will not bear thinking of. Incongruous marvels and incomprehensible mysteries melt away under the lens of reason, as the blood of St. Januarius liquefies under the miraculously concentrated rays of the sun. It is a strange inscription wherewith to greet the eyes of a man of good



sense who is halting on the threshold of the revealed; "Your minds abandon ye who enter here;" it is an ingenious and taking effort of flattery to point out to the silly and the timorous a vast, shadowy, trackless region of quasi-mental exertitions over which they may disport themselves as the superiors of the wise and the brave. It is, as it were, the corollary of such tactics to turn upon the thoughtful and to say, "You stand aloof in the vanity of your reasons, in the pride of your souls. It is the need of submission that repels you; you cannot bear to worship, to revere. You hate our God, who rates your minds so low that he will neither consult nor satisfy them. You hate us, his priests, because we can show you what otherwise you could not see. You hate us too, because we hold the allegiance and love of these his sheep, delivering them thereby from the alternative of an intellectual tyranny in which you would be the oppressors. You hate us worst of all because we hold our office from him, and we magnify it; because we are his delegates, and claim from you all the authority and respect which to such office and delegation of right belong." It is false all this—as false as the worst lie ever ascribed by them to the devil whom they have fabricated. No man of decent intellect was ever or could ever be fool enough to reject revelation for pride's sake. Who would willingly go to hell to indulge his vanity? It is a lie, a solemn-sounding lie, told to perpetuate the enslavement of the feeble, a new staple driven to refix the fetters of the struggling. A hundred influences combine to deter the strongest and most uncompromising mind from the hazard of scepticism. There is the natural fear of being wrong upon so momentous a question; there is the distrust of self, which is usually strong in exact proportion to the strength which it distrusts; there is unwillingness to hurt the feelings of parent, or friend, or wife; there is reluctance to complicate the responsibilities, already so great, in the education of children. These are a few of the internal checks upon scepticism. Do those who prate of the vanity of intellect imagine for a moment that it outweighs these things? The most temporary possession of it would undeceive them.

With what are commonly called "the evidences of Christianity," it is manifestly not the purpose of this article to deal. They belong to a later stage, indeed, to a different order of discussion. They are apart from the direct and primary defence of the doctrine which we have stated and assailed. Indirectly and secondarily they may be utilized in its favour, no doubt. But the direct charge against the doctrine is that it is intellectually incomprehensible by man, and therefore to be rejected by man. This charge must be met either by proof that it is intellectually comprehensible, or else that the mind is not the proper instru-

ment whereby it should be tested. We have shown a negative conclusion on the first of these two points, a positive conclusion on the second of them, to be alike inevitable. The only condition on which we can condescend, as the Scotch say, upon the discussion of what have been known as "the evidences" since the days of Paley, is that their exhibitors shall confess the *prima facie* impossibility of the doctrine, and admit that the mind is the sole instrument given us wherewith to judge of its reception. Then, but not before, the "evidences" may be adduced to show that it is impossible that Christianity should have been either a delusion or an imposture of its founders, and that the mind, having thus to balance one difficulty against another, one improbability against another, one impossibility against another, must decide in favour of orthodoxy. Nor is this limitation unfair. For if the doctrine could be shown to be comprehensible we should scarcely care to ask for evidence. Or if the mind were shown not to be the proper instrument for adjudication in the matter, but that there was such a faculty as faith, and that by faith the doctrine was to be received without mental process, evidence would be an uninteresting surplusage. So that the need of evidence does not begin until either the incomprehensibility has been conceded, or the mind named arbiter by both parties. The incomprehensibility and the judicial installation of the mind are points to be settled before Paley can even be heard to speak.

One other point in connexion with the "evidences" ought also to be borne in mind. They are for the most part not even by intention proofs of the intrinsic truth of the doctrines of Christianity. They merely affect to be links of proof, whereby certain dogmata are supposed to be traced to their source in the declarations and teachings of a certain group of persons. The miracles, indeed, stand somewhat apart from the rest, but we believe that at this time few champions of orthodoxy care to rest its case upon them. For it is seen now by every one that even if their actual occurrence were admitted, those who relied on them would be found in a fresh difficulty. They would have to admit in their turn—indeed they would insist that they were wrought by the permission of the Almighty. Then they would have to admit that it had pleased God to permit the promulgation and maintenance of more than one false faith in the world—*videlicet*, Brahminism and Buddhism, during many centuries previous to the introduction of Christianity. Also that he permitted the employment of such means as were necessary to persuade mankind to the acceptance of those false faiths. That he not only permitted them to be employed, but to be efficacious. How can they tell, then, that it was not a part of his general purpose to permit the promulgation and maintenance of a third false faith

—*videlicet*, Christianity, and that he consequently permitted or connived at the miracles, inasmuch as they were the means the employment of which would be most efficacious for the persuasion of the peculiar race and epoch upon which Christianity was to be first implanted?

The only other point in which the "evidences" can be said to carry the case further than to show that the dogmata of Christianity emanated from Jesus and his apostles, is the argument as to the improbability either that he or they would have died for a conscious imposture, or that the imposture was unconscious either in him or them. But before this question of improbability could be raised, it would be necessary to show pretty clearly that these dogmata are either his or theirs. And on this preliminary point there are some questions which may well be suggested for the consideration of any one who might be tempted to uphold the affirmative.

1. Will the best instructed and most candid theologians affirm that the four Gospels as we have them are either transcripts or translations of four Gospels actually written by the four Evangelists? In other words, were the four Gospels as they now exist actually compiled by the persons whose names they bear? On the contrary, is it not admitted that the four original narratives are lost—lost, that is, in the sense in which Sappho's Poems or the missing books of Livy are lost?

2. Is it not admitted that many and various biographies of Jesus were compiled during the first few centuries after his death?

3. Is it not also admitted by the most competent and candid theologians that the four Gospels now read were compilations authoritatively made later, at all events, than the end of the first century after the death of Jesus, out of existing materials, good and bad—the worst-believed and the most trumpery of the various legends and marvels being discarded, and the best-believed and most dignified being retained?

4. What is the date of the oldest known manuscript of any Gospel, or of any Epistle?

5. Upon the genuineness of how many of the Epistles has doubt fairly arisen among orthodox and heterodox critics alike? Of how many of them would a candid theologian say that he unreservedly believed them to be the work of the writer to whom they are canonically ascribed?

6. Are not important paragraphs and phrases, even in those assumed to be genuine, believed to be interpolations?

By what has here been said it is not pretended to cover the ground of any future discussion on the "evidences" of Christianity. It is not even intended to mark out such a discussion

in outline. As we have already said, before we enter on this arena of argument, we demand a serious answer to the essential position which we have taken up, which is this: that the fundamental doctrine of Christianity is incomprehensible by the mind, in the positive sense of a violation and affront, and yet that the mind is the only faculty by which we can ultimately judge of it. At the same time the questions we have suggested on the authenticity of the writings of the New Testament are crucial, and they are worth recording even at this stage. They have been answered many-times in one way by one party, but they have been systematically shunned or evaded by the other. And yet it is surely idle to talk of the inferences to be drawn from the contemporary biographies of Jesus as to his power, his origin, his honesty, till we know whether we have, or ever have had, any such biographies—idle to write octavo volumes about St. Paul's views on the Incarnation and Atonement, when we do not know how far he has stated any! Did he write the Epistle to the Hebrews? History and criticism have at least provided a *prima facie* case for the negative in all these cases. It is this *prima facie* case which we want to see answered. Why does not somebody answer it?

Into the mouth of the Christian professor, calling upon the bewildered spectator of all the creeds, we put these words, "See what Christianity has done for the world!" The obvious answer to this somewhat desperate, though very common, apology is that in their way and time and turn the other creeds have probably done very nearly as much. Such a retort would be true, and being true would be quite conclusive; for it is plain that if Christianity were to be chosen definitely on that ground, there must also have been a time at which every one of its competitors was equally deserving of selection, and its dogmata of adoption. As if morals and a sanction for morals were not things distinguishable! As if Moses were to be admitted to have had personal interviews with the Deity because he laid down certain moral principles, which were by no means new, for the guidance of the Hebrews! Does the blindest reader of the Pentateuch imagine that blasphemy, murder, adultery, and theft were unknown as crimes to the ancient Egyptians who preceded Moses, or to Oriental moralists, like Confucius, who never heard of him? The excellent *morale* of the Khoran does not induce belief in the pretensions of Mahomet; why should the Decalogue or the Sermon on the Mount be supposed to prove the inspiration of Moses or the deity of Christ? The fact is that in some points the moral theory of Christianity has improved since it left the hands of its founder. Many of the virtues are now valued theoretically for themselves, which by him were only advocated for their conse-

quences. And, at all events, it is certain that neither the moral precepts of the New Testament, nor any subsequent development of or improvement on them, have ever gone beyond the spirit in which Socrates propounds his ideas of man's duty towards man in the uninspired pages of the Republic of Plato.

Somewhat akin to the defence of Christianity on the ground of result, is the ingenious but equally refutable apology for it on the score of its "relative truth." Some people are apt to maunder about that which is perhaps a little outworn now and overgrown, having been once beautiful and estimable, and to protest against the cruelty and iniquity of assailing with passionate rigour that which has done its duty by the world, and had its rise in the best aspirations of the best of men. If in this they only asked a vigorous and reforming present to respect, even while it denounces them, things that are now valueless because they once were valuable, to deal tenderly with the relics of the past for the sake of the services of the past, they would meet with nothing but assent. But the apology means more than that. It is a plea for maintenance, not for gentleness, for acquiescence and acceptance, not for toleration or forbearance. Stories of revelation are not moral or social systems, which can contain both truth and falsehood. To be true at all they must be absolutely true, and if they are false at all they are absolutely false. There can be no half-way positions for them, and no half-measures with them. Every attempt to coquette with or to tinker them is a conscious fraud. Either the Almighty's finger cut the Decalogue on two tables of stone or it did not. Either Jesus was God incarnate, in the plain sense of the words, or he was not. If he was not, then there was imposture or delusion somewhere, either in him, or in his followers immediate or later; and that imposture, or that delusion, should be unmasked or cleared away. That, whichever it was, it may have performed services to the world is nothing. We may record these as we go, and take them into consideration when we come to pass sentence, but we must have a plain verdict first.

It is right that before we conclude we should call the attention of our readers more particularly to the Duke of Somerset's book. It is a work that everybody ought to read. It is admirable in its way, and still more admirable than itself is the conduct of its author in giving it to the world. The fact of its appearance is of great import; of greater import even than its contents, which are themselves well worth having. This we say in all frankness, and all those who fancy that they can coin an argument or a laugh or a sneer out of the admission, may do so. The book is not all new, nor is it anything like exhaustive. It is not a fresh treatise against Christianity. It is rather a

series of more or less unconnected chapters involving a string of reminiscences of old points of controversy. It seems almost to assume an antecedent rejection of the main doctrine of Christianity, and to employ itself upon the exposure of certain minor flaws in the stated case of orthodoxy. Throughout, it has more of enunciation than of argument; and the greater number of the thirty-nine short chapters of which it is made up—was the number thirty-nine chosen to match the Thirty-nine Articles?—are substantially detached challenges to the other side to explain discrepancies of detail. At the same time it is plain that the Duke is a man of clear mind and considerable research, who has thought out his present position systematically; however, he has not in this book put systematically forward the stages through which such a position is made good. For instance, his first chapter, which is on what he calls “The First Difficulty,” that is, on the Devil, is not a direct or philosophical argument against the doctrine of the connexion between the Agency of Evil and the Omnipotence of God as propounded by the Christian Church. It is simply a collection of historical facts tending to show indirectly that the notion of the Devil has varied from time to time, that it was not first promulgated or even originally treated by Jesus, and that it has not been maintained in a consistent or unchanging shape by the Christian Church. So, too, one of his later chapters upon “Faith,” is not an investigation of faith as a so-called faculty of man. It is rather a few detached sentences, pungent and suggestive many of them no doubt, which point the reader to the inference that faith is a term undefined by its professors, and one that is used in many senses even by St. Paul, who was in a great degree its inventor. Ah, that somebody would, as the Duke hints, come forward and tell us the difference between faith and credulity! Many of the topics which he discusses are in this character collateral and subordinate to the great issue. Such, for instance, is his apology for the Jews who, as he suggests with more than a show of reason, were bound under all the curses of their law to kill Jesus. Such again is the point he makes against the argument which Paley has raised in favour of miracles as a sanction for the divine mission of their worker, showing that the Jews received John the Baptist as a prophet, though he worked no miracles, while they rejected Jesus who laid such stress upon his own. Nor is he following a less subordinate line of thought when he points out that the circumstances and influence of the translation of the Septuagint, the theology of the Apocrypha, and the establishment of synagogues in Palestine and elsewhere, were terms, as it were, in a series of changes that had its last power in the appearance of Christianity. We might multiply

such instances until we had exhausted the subject matter of the book. Throughout it is able, but it is suggestive rather than argumentative. It is not exhaustive; it is not shapely. It is not finished enough to convert, but it is too telling not to incite to inquiry. To our thinking the most valuable parts of it are the chapters in which the writer indicates the contradictions in spirit and tenour between the Epistles on the one hand, and the four Gospels and the Book of Acts on the other, especially in the want of harmony between the St. Paul of the Epistles and the St. Paul of the Acts. Hardly less good are those in which he exposes the unsatisfactory character of the Pauline philosophy and the varying metaphorical use of words by St. Paul, the effects of which went much further than merely to confuse his style. His love of the byepaths of his subject has led him to devote a chapter to the warrantless obstinacy of Stephen's character and the irrelevance of the protomartyr's speech in his own defence before the Sanhedrim. In a word, his book is not a text book of religious liberty, nor even a handbook to inquiry. It is merely the book of a man who, having made up his mind upon a great subject, comes forward to say as much from conscientious motives; and without troubling or enlightening the world with a carefully arranged narrative of the process by which he has arrived at his conclusion, gives it a budget of the minor considerations which have weighed with him, and of small points which have struck him from time to time. But, we repeat it, the book is valuable. Valuable, because its very authorship will "strengthen the feeble knees;" valuable because the points it raises or alludes to are all interesting, and, although they are treated in a somewhat desultory and unconnected fashion, there is not one of them which is not so handled as to open out to the intending inquirer a vista of investigation which will lead him, if he pursue it, to important results; valuable, because its publication is an act of courage, of generosity, of chivalry—excellences which may be in him hereditary analogues of feudal types; valuable, too, because in the end it must or ought to provoke that sort of serious reply from the opposite party, the appearance of which it is the moderate hope of the writer of this article that he may be found to have accelerated, and a disputative directness for which he has herein earnestly endeavoured to anticipate and to bespeak.

---

## ART. VI.—NAPOLEON THE FIRST: THE MAN.

*Histoire de Napoleon 1er.* Par P. LANFREY. Paris: 1870.

THE extremes of opinion, which too often surge about the prominent phases in the character of many remarkable men, enveloping them in a denaturalizing, deflecting, or distorting mist, have gathered around those of the First Napoleon with an unusually dense degree of misleading violence. We hail with pleasure, therefore, any attempt to give us a glimpse of the reality from a stand-point situated, if not altogether in the serene ether of absolute impartiality, at all events above any grossly perturbed atmosphere of passion or prejudice. In spite of numerous accusatory criticisms, there appears ample evidence for assuming that M. Lanfrey has conscientiously endeavoured to fulfil the broad duties, if not the extreme exigencies, of an impartial biographer. To assert that he hates Napoleon as Tacitus and Suetonius hated Tiberius, is to jar harshly against the whole tone and tenor of his work. Rarely does he obtrude any sign of predetermined depreciation, or raise his denunciative utterance above the vehemence permissible to outraged ordinary moral feelings. On the other hand, to say that he presents the balance of justice unweighted by an occasional severity of expression or colouring, would merely betray a delusive attempt to endow him with preternatural impartiality: but then it may be justly affirmed that the accent or final attitude of his hero seldom, if ever, degenerates into a misleading dissonance or a caricature. In a word, the position which he appears fairly entitled to assume stands as widely distant from the detractors as from the sycophants of the First Napoleon.

Very little hesitation tends to arrest the conviction that this high estimate of M. Lanfrey's work will rarely meet with ready acceptance. By Frenchmen, with here and there an exception, it would assuredly be regarded as an abetment of rank heresy. French historians are generally so notoriously prone to exaggerated partisanship, that when impartiality pervades a historical work it very naturally experiences considerable difficulty in exorcising popular incredulity. Moderation, moreover, is by no means a conspicuous feature in the French character; and as impartiality in writers can only be truly appreciated by readers imbued with a spirit more or less willing to take a similar unbiassed direction, we cannot be surprised at the infrequent appearance of that quality in the productions of French historians or biographers. With this general bias towards exaggeration,



the mind of the French multitude may confidently be expected to regard with disaffection, if not with positive anger, any dispassionate and clearly-defined history of its chief national idol, Napoleon the First. It delights to revel in the pages of Savary, Meneval, Desmarets, Bignon, Thiers. There it beholds its Jugenath, hurrying from battle-field to battle-field, surrounded by a dazzling and vanity-inspiring halo of glory ! The presence of equitable judgment in the estimation of a character surrounded by such intensely-exciting prepossessions cannot, therefore, be reasonably anticipated, unless it be sought in a historian possessing an exceptionally high moral and intellectual nature. Yet even the high priests of the apotheosized "hero" are fain to leave exposed a few unsightly stains on the imperial mantle, the seemingly arrangement of which has ever defied the most cunning manipulation. M. Bignon, to whom was specially confided the mission to defend the memory of Napoleon before Europe, whilst admitting the indefinite extension of the enterprises of the Emperor, endeavours to show that the prolongation of hostilities was solely referrible to the resistance which the Cabinets of Europe opposed to the Empire from its very birth. M. Thiers also blames, with—as might be anticipated—much circumlocution and qualification, the Prussian war in 1806, the Spanish war in 1808, the harsh treatment of the Pope in 1809, and the war with Russia. These enterprises, however, were in a measure imposed upon Napoleon by the fatality of the position which he had arrogantly assumed—by the vast system which he had engendered in his brain towards the end of 1805 : they were no mere political accidents, but rather the logical consequences of a fundamental idea.

In awarding to M. Lanfrey a very high, if not the highest, position amongst the historians of Napoleon, we have no wish to detract from the merits—notably the courage—which other French writers have displayed when reviewing, in any of their questionable aspects, the character and career of a man who is rarely mentioned amongst Frenchmen except in inflated strains of eulogy. As an instance, listen for a moment to M. de Carné. At the close of an eloquent denunciation of the obstinate persistence of Napoleon in a course which was carrying devastation over the fairest parts of Europe merely to test the possibility of achieving for the ruthless destroyer a colossal but preposterous despotic power, he exclaims, "What, in reality, was that gigantic aggression against history, against right, and against the inner life of peoples ? What were the attempts to reduce Italians, Spaniards, Portuguese, and Germans to the condition of vassals ruled by French princes, but delirious efforts to restore in the midst of Christian civilization the *régime* of pagan Rome !" —

"No shadow of a doubt," he observes, "can obscure the fact that the final catastrophe which subverted the Empire was strictly logical: the system of Napoleon had rendered it inevitable."

Nor is it disputable that opinions regarding Napoleon similar to those expressed by M. Lanfrey have long been familiar to Englishmen in the pages of their own historians, and in the episodic reflections upon Napoleon scattered in a multitude of publications. Equal familiarity with such opinions is observable in the works of American writers. Who is unacquainted with Channing's celebrated "Essay on Napoleon?" Though no parade of examples tending to prove the prevalence of such views is needed, we are nevertheless tempted to quote the following opinion which a distinguished writer and thinker entertained of Napoleon, inasmuch as it points to certain traits in the character of the French Emperor which are eloquently commented upon by M. Lanfrey, and to which frequent allusion will be made in the few following pages. "Napoleon was," says De Quincey, "as regards moral capacities, even for common generosity, much more for magnanimity, about the poorest creature ever known."

M. Lanfrey claims our admiration chiefly for the rare degree of moral courage which he has displayed in expressing many truthful opinions concerning Napoleon, which are profoundly antagonistic to the cherished sentiments of his countrymen. He is the first French writer of unquestionable reputation who, in a work of any considerable pretensions, has dared to concentrate the full light of historic truth, in all its varied rays, upon the man who is, emphatically, among modern conquerors, the least worthy to merit praiseworthy distinction. Though often vehement and even impassioned in his language, he seldom forsakes the high position of a judge: rarely is he present as an advocate. Many of his statements will, no doubt, astonish as well as offend the majority of his countrymen, who are always more disposed to treat the positive faults of historical writers with lenity than to overlook their temperance and impartiality. Rarely, moreover, does M. Lanfrey fail to adduce overwhelming evidence before pronouncing condemnation upon any act, or branding with insignificance any capacity, of Napoleon. This heaping up of unquestionable facts, in order to render stable the ground upon which he is progressing, is one of the chief and most commendable features of his work. So evident is this, that, at the conclusion of many a paragraph, fancy, transporting us for a moment to the mathematical studies of our youth, traces the well-remembered old formula—*Quod erat demonstrandum*.

In the early pages of M. Lanfrey's work, we see Bonaparte as [Vol. XCVII. No. CXCI.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. XLI. No. II. D D

he stood within the narrow circle of his family, or in relation to those public affairs and political struggles which were cooped up within the narrow precincts of his island home. The future tyrant of France and scourge of Europe was yet unconscious of his own strength, or rather of the social, political, and military rottenness which he was soon to encounter. The world had not yet riveted its gaze upon him ; temptations to personal aggrandizement and ambition had not yet troubled his imagination : he stands before us unmasked, and with the delicate bloom still mantling his character. What is the general and broad impression produced by the apparition presented to us ? Into what forms do the lines of its chief features resolve themselves ?

It is in the guise of a lofty and immaculate patriot that the youthful Bonaparte first arrests our attention. We behold him in 1790 an enthusiastic and, no doubt, a sincere admirer of Paoli, whom he afterwards abandoned, defamed, and persecuted. In 1791, in his *Lettre à Matteo Buttafuoco*—the man whom Choiseul had chosen as his political agent in Corsica—he overwhelms with a pure but vehement torrent of indignation the violators of the freedom of his country, and ardently appeals to all those glowing and glorious conceptions of right and wrong which are so attractive to the rightly-constituted mind of ingenuous youth. He had fully participated in the popular delirious acclamations which greeted the Revolution of 1789 ; but his ardent admiration for regenerated France had failed to subdue, or even allay, his patriotic anger at the arbitrary manner in which she had gained possession of Corsica. It must surely be conceded that, thus far, certain generous impulses unequivocally maintained their supremacy in his mind, and successfully resisted all attempts, whether argumentative or interested, to undermine or sully them. But the ethereal heights to which his mind had reached were not altogether beyond the sphere of sublunary attraction. There were latent tendencies struggling within him, directly converging towards an ultimate absorption of every faculty in an unscrupulous egotism. The effect which those famous, or infamous, days, the 20th June, the 10th August, and the 2nd September, produced upon the yet indeterminately-floating mind of the man who was destined to become one of the most expert and “glorious” scientific slaughterers of his race, was perceptibly to sully with the thick noisome atmosphere of this lower world its conspicuous but surface-rooted purity. The chivalrous partisan of Paoli, the worshipper of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity, turned with precipitant instinctive geniality towards power, order, and stability begotten of fear. On the 20th of June he expressed regret to his friend Bourrienne that there was no means of

"sweeping away all that *canaille*." He identified liberty with its abuse. His mind was of too strictly formal a cast to admit the wisdom of any political system based, however inconsiderably, upon a tolerance of occasional health-giving general political activity. But he continued not the less a seeming disciple of the Revolution, even during its most deplorable excesses, for his cool penetration detected a present firmness in its steps which he esteemed worthy to enter as an integrant figure into the cynical calculations of his ambition.

The siege of Toulon was the determining turning-point in the sentiments and fortunes of Bonaparte. It was there that a policy founded on self-exaltation formally subordinated to its rigid dictates every faculty of his mind and every feeling of his heart. It was there that he first attracted the notice of Europe, and inaugurated that dazzling series of victories which gradually blinded, and eventually enslaved, the French people.

Before we follow Bonaparte from that terrible scene of carnage at Toulon, and trace his career through some of its principal stages, it should not be forgotten that the harsh features of his moral character which suddenly became so prominent would, judging from his youthful antecedents, have probably remained, if not altogether hidden, at least not offensively discernible, if he had not at that time caught sight of an illimitable perspective so inviting to his limitless ambition. There was one element, however, in his character which powerfully tends to modify the amount of forbearance to which he is justly entitled. Bonaparte never erred through passion or sentimental exaltation. His youth was short: his transition to manhood immediate. His most passionate acts were generally pre-formulated, and the decisions arrived at by his understanding were usually the results of a mental process uninfluenced by the presence of human sympathy, of pity, or of remorse.

"We rapidly grow older on the field of battle." Though the appositeness of this aphorism to Bonaparte, to whom its first expression is attributed, is unquestionable, its universal, or even general applicability, at least in relation to the higher moral sensibilities, is very disputable. To Bonaparte, indeed, the modifying element of time in the affirmation can claim but little latitude. Thoughts and feelings usually the products of half a life of sinister experience came upon him as if by inspiration. He descended from the heights of Toulon fully equipped to encounter with advantage the sternest eventualities, and to contend successfully against the greatest proficients in worldly wisdom. He had silenced hesitation: not even a regretful sigh escaped him at the sudden disappearance of that bright mirage of liberty,

of patriotism, of all the higher impulses and aspirations which had floated before his youthful imagination and inspired his feelings. There was no graduation of declining principle ; no descending to a lower deep. As general of the Republican army in Italy, as First Consul, as Emperor, Bonaparte was the same. On the moral nature which he disclosed in early prominent life progressive years impressed but few determinate variations ; though it should be noted that the predominant tendency in such changes was evidently to modify many of the harsher and darker tints which overshadowed his character.

"Soldiers, I am about to lead you into the most fertile country of the world . . . . You will there find honour, glory, riches." These words form part of Bonaparte's first proclamation to the army of Italy. Do they not emphasize a certain maturity of tone which no lapse of time could intensify ? Where shall we find fuller-grown utterances from any veteran conqueror, or captain of condottieri ? "People of Italy, the French army comes to break your chains." This from the same mouth ! Has the utterer of these words anything to learn from hypocrisy ? If arguments drawn from the stern armoury of facts—the gross deficiency, for instance, of material essentials for the army—permit the casting of a thin veil of palliation over the proclamation to the soldiers, how can we temper our verdict of condemnation on the address to the people of Italy ? Amidst all this precocious and well-drilled cynicism in the young soldier, there would, nevertheless, flash forth at times, as a sort of protest against the unnatural and derogatory autocracy of mere egotism, a ray of unselfish generosity. Let it not be forgotten—for such redeeming facts rarely present themselves along the course of the selfish life we are, in some of its more emphatic moral stages, depicting—let it not be forgotten that, in his previous association with the army of Italy, Bonaparte had bravely used his influence to mitigate the tyrannical proscriptions which then formed part of the political machinery employed by the French government ; and it is recorded that, in face of no little danger to himself, he rescued, at the period to which we have just referred, a host of unfortunate *émigrés* that had fallen into the hands of the Republican army. The occurrence, however, of such laudable accidents—for their infrequency goes far to prove their fortuitous character—in a pitilessly selfish life is necessarily accompanied by a feeling of irritation, and irresistibly tends to place in strong, perhaps unnatural, relief more questionable, no less than positively criminal, acts—an occasional gleam of light rendering more glaring the dark obtrusive presence of soul-hardening ambition.

Within the short period—less than four years—which intervened between his nomination to the command of the army of Italy, and his installation as First Consul, Bonaparte—not yet thirty years of age—had attained a degree of perfection in the refinements of duplicity, in the atrocious art of deadening feeling and conscience when invited by self-interest, or even mere convenience, to perpetrate cold-blooded wholesale massacre, and in those infamous attributes which minister to the imposition of a military despotism upon a trusting and liberty-loving people, reaching, if not surpassing, the point which any “hero” embalmed in the pages of history can boast. “Venice,” says Bonaparte in a letter to the Directory, “Venice is more worthy to enjoy liberty than any other city of Italy.” In a few weeks, the man who had uttered that eulogy, the then most obtrusive of Republican generals, defying the strict injunctions of the Government of Republican France, delivered the venerable Republic of Venice, bound hand and foot, into the possession of Austria! In truth, the treaty of Campo Formio—containing an unsurpassably cool appropriation and interchange of territories and peoples—was a display of insensibility even to the mere surface promptings and sentiments of ordinary human justice and feeling, which might have been regarded with envy by the most unscrupulous and experienced of hoary-headed spoliators. No despot ever penned a negotiation with less regard for the rights and feelings of his fellow creatures; nor did Napoleon, even when in the full maturity of life, and disposing of a latitude of absolute sway unequalled in Europe since the time of Charlemagne, ever again attempt to sound the depths of that infamous treaty.

Probably with the same pen which had served to sign the treaty of Campo Formio, Bonaparte traced the following words to the Directory: “It behoves me now to enter again into the crowd . . . . to present an example of aversion for a military form of government, a form by which so many republics have been destroyed.” This accords well with the flattering eulogy publicly addressed a few weeks later to the spoliator of Italy by M. de Talleyrand. The hero who had dictated the peace of Campo Formio, and had lived in regal splendour, regally dispensing favours and power, at the Château of Montebello, was declared in that eulogistic oration to possess “little taste except for simplicity, for obscurity, for the abstract sciences, and for that sublime Ossian who seemed to detach him from all sublunary influences.” The witty and astute Minister of Foreign Affairs, not less cynical at times than the man whom he was then posterously eulogizing, must have thrilled with exquisite delight whilst enacting and enunciating such an extravagant farce. In

ascribing disinterestedness and simplicity to Bonaparte, there is, indeed, something so intensely antithetical to the real character of the man, that, confronted by the crass obtuseness which could accept the accuracy of the caricature in spite of the living and acting entity before it, there exists at least a momentary disposition to sympathize with the future Liberticide. It was not, however, towards the destruction of liberty in France that Bonaparte was at that time wholly directing his attention. As some compensation and equivalent for the doubts and probable mischances which hung over the accomplishment of his most ardent ambition and prayers,—a distinctly acknowledged absolute authority at home,—he fed his mental vision upon gorgeous vistas foregleaming the not remote acquisition of some vast Eastern empire.

The expedition to Egypt was designed as the initial stealthy step towards the realization of that magnificent dream. Though destined finally to collapse, the presumptuous and immaturity-estimated adventure was fated to leave behind it indelible traces of crime. "Soldiers," said Bonaparte, pointing to the Pyramids, "remember that forty centuries contemplate your actions"—the scrutiny surely not being directed with less intensity towards the general than towards the mass of the army. Scarcely had the echoes of that theatrical exclamation, which had pompously insinuated an approaching spectacle of superlative heroism, passed away, when the venerable structures were called upon to witness a blood-stained act more ghastly in its turpitude than had for a hundred generations been perpetrated within their darkest shadow. A vast deal of commendable horror has been expressed both verbally and in print at the murder of the Duc d'Enghien. Far be it from us to insinuate that a syllable too much has been uttered in execration of that infamous deed; but we cannot help being struck by the great, if not unnatural, disparity which presents itself between the amount of condemnation heaped upon that crime, and the measure of censure bestowed upon the massacre at Jaffa. The human mind, fully capable of grasping the distinctive traits of an individual murder, when overflowed by multitudinous slaughter sinks into a state of semi-paralysis; the concrete tends towards the abstract, loses, amidst a chaos of details, the power to rivet effective attention, and gradually melts away into unimpressive indistinctness. The youth and innocence of the Prince, the dungeon, the mock trial, the fosse, the night, the *prepared* grave, forcibly appeal to the feelings and the imagination. Yet for that deed Bonaparte cannot be classed far below an ordinary murderer. Strict justice—if justice had been permitted to take its customary

course—demanded no more than that the culprit should be hanged. There may, indeed, have existed certain causes for the act—"reasons of State," for instance, which in the popular belief are supposed to possess peculiar properties and capacities for covering a multitude of sins—that may almost have amounted to a shadow of excuse. But the deed of blood at Jaffa was an unmitigated two-thousand-fold murder. The poor Albanians were prisoners of war: they had surrendered their arms on condition that their lives should be spared: the condition was deliberately accepted and solemnly ratified "on the faith of a Christian." The doomed lads—for the prisoners were mostly very young—were ranked upon the sea shore, and, excepting a few who escaped to a rock near the coast, shot. The trembling remnants of the two thousand were enticed from their last poor refuge by an assurance that slaughter was glutted, that no more blood should be shed,—a promise once more affirmed "on the faith of a Christian,"—and shot. The excuses alleged in justification of this bloody act are too contemptible to merit refutation; the sole end and aim being to escape a little temporary embarrassment. The escape was effected, but its means, wrought "on the faith of a Christian," have left behind a stain of infamy that no sophistry can ever lighten, much less obliterate. Retribution for the single assassination promptly heralded its approach by the shadow of isolation with which it surrounded the criminal. The death of the Duc d'Enghien was probably one of the chief causes which suscitated against Napoleon the coalition of 1805—the germ of all subsequent coalitions designed to frustrate the mad attempt to refound the dominion of Charlemagne. It shocked and roused the feelings of mankind, and powerfully contributed to engender a chronic state of antagonism against the French Empire. The punishment in this case was, to some extent, visible and traceable. The more atrocious act was less palpably and immediately avenged; but as the footprints of history advance, and actions are estimated with less reference to conventional associations, the ineffably cold-blooded multiple murder will surely elicit an ever-increasing amount of execration.

The fabric of an Eastern Empire which Bonaparte had mentally built up with a mass of shapeless and heterogeneous materials, quickly dissolved before the first rude practical attempts to convert it into a substantial entity. But the most enticing portion of the huge ambition with which the man whom we have heard invoking the gaze of forty centuries upon his deeds had filled his mind was very far indeed from presenting any symptoms of dissolution. The Directory had apparently fallen into a state of irretrievable weakness and disorder. Distracted by



conflicts which were but the logical results deducible from the mechanism and, to some extent, from the principles of her political institutions, France was fully prepared to acclaim—without, however, sacrificing her late dearly-bought political and social acquisitions—any intervention which promised peace and governmental stability. The actual prospect before her was replete with prognostics of disaster. Schérer at the head of her armies, and Barras at the helm of State, were fast hurrying her to defeat and anarchy. Bonaparte, superabundantly supplied with effective energy, designedly abandoned the government to its fate, in deference to the pressing behests of his ambition. “That I may become master of France,”—such are his words,—“it is necessary that during my absence in Egypt the Directory should experience reverses, and that I should return and again lead our armies to victory.”

“Is it then for this,” exclaimed the courageous Destrem to Bonaparte on the 18 Brumaire—“is it then for this that you have conquered?” There can be no doubt at all as to the end purposed; the cynical words of the conqueror himself unequivocally affirm it. If, however, judicious support had been withheld from the Government, treacherous assistance had been prodigally thrust upon it. Who, for instance, had promptly furnished overwhelming physical aid to the low ambition of certain disreputable and incompetent members of the Government on the 18 Fructidor, and thus inaugurated the usurpation of the military power over the civil authority? Who had incited the Directory to pursue a course of conquest, and then transported its most efficient army to Egypt? To urge, in mitigation of the imposition of despotic power, the impotency and rottenness of the Directory, possesses no grain of honest validity. France had made fearful and almost superhuman struggles to obtain and consolidate her freedom: her sacrifices had been enormous. Had she fallen so low, morally and politically, that no alternative remained to her but a final fall into anarchy, or a resilient step into despotism? Surely, with the consciousness of possessing adequate ability, a truly honest man and patriot could easily have found a means of escaping such a dilemma. Bonaparte had that power and deliberately abused it; yet premising, as he seldom failed to do when about to commit an act of colossal iniquity, a formal deception. He swore “to establish a liberal and moderate government, founded upon the double basis of equality at home and peace abroad.” In fairness to the First Consul, we ought to point attention to the presence of a considerable grain of positive intention in this mountain of fraudulent promise. There can be no doubt that he deliberately determined to carry out to its extreme literality one clause at

least in the above solemn declaration. Every means, direct or indirect, every subterfuge, specious or infamous, that could be made available, was fearlessly directed towards establishing a centralized despotism that should parade, in imitation of Eastern political modes, "its irresistible and pitiless level on a bed of human dust."

The *coup d'état* of the 18 Brumaire effected a gross and cowardly usurpation. It subjected France, disenchanted from a host of Utopias, yet clinging with hopeful and trusting tenacity to the principles she had formulated in 1789, to a single will, and ruthlessly impelled her to become the scourge of Europe. "Conquest," said the usurper, "made me what I am ; conquest alone can maintain me in that position." Estimated according to the data that he had before him, data for which he himself was mainly responsible, this was plausibly logical. And yet, in a letter to George III., written about this time, he emphatically avows that peace is not only "le premier des besoins," but, with rather transparent hypocrisy, declares it to be "la première des gloires." Conscious, however, of the fascination which the fundamental aspects of the Revolution still exercised over the mind of the French nation, he dexterously perverted that ineradicable influence towards confirming and consolidating the policy contemplated by the *coup d'état*. The fraudulent invocation of principles which he despised was, indeed, on various important, and even unimportant, occasions one of his most favourite strata-gems. His proficiency in the use of sentimental cant, political or other, has rarely, if ever, been equalled. As an instance of the extravagant test to which he occasionally subjected the credulity of others, the following passage in a letter of his to the Emperor of Austria may be cited ; "La meilleure politique aujourd'hui c'est la simplicité et la vérité !" When, however, he seriously attempted to grapple with momentous political questions, his generally quick perception was cramped and distorted by the geometrical mould in which his mind was cast. Besides, he had but slight acquaintance with modern political science : certainly to the higher qualities which are the necessary possessions of distinguished statesmen or politicians he is incapable of presenting any admissible claim. His political principles were in admirable and strict keeping with his military genius. Supervision radiating unswervingly and mechanically from a central authority was his most favoured conception of a perfect governmental establishment. "Everything for the people, nothing by them," was the generative assumption from which he, like Frederick the Great, educed his political system. He presents us in the following words with a summary of his fundamental views on this point : "Que me parle-t-on de bonté, de justice abstraite, de lois

naturelles? La première loi, c'est le nécessité; la première justice, c'est le salut public." Subjected to the rigid exactions of such a system, there can be little surprise at the decline which literature experienced under the Empire. In answer to an earnest appeal made by Auguste Staël on behalf of his exiled mother, who promised that if permitted to return to France she would abstain from all political disquisition, the master of France exclaimed, "Bah! de la politique, n'en fait-on pas en parlant de morale, de littérature, de toute au monde?" Yielding to his unmitigated contempt for all temporizing political theories, and to the whisperings of his ambition, Napoleon turned with aversion from every system of government but that of a military despotism. "On ne gouverne," he declared, "qu'avec des éperons et des bottes!"

Napoleon's deficiency in administrative ability is scarcely less evident than his conspicuous ignorance of the higher branches of political science. The accuracy of this assertion will, no doubt, be regarded by many with suspicion, if not with a still harsher feeling. The eulogists of Napoleon have so persistently and absolutely assigned to him the credit of all that was admirable and praiseworthy, especially in reference to administrative reform, which was effected for France under the Consulate and the Empire, that the assertion has finally assumed the rank of an established historical fact. Wondrous, indeed, has been the aid afforded by iterated assumptions towards building up the fame of Napoleon; but in presence of positive and substantial evidence, such arrogations mostly stand confessed as sheer inanities. To what extent, for instance, can Napoleon claim to have contributed towards the construction of the Civil Code, a masterpiece with which he has presumptuously associated his name? To whatever of good is in it—and the amount of that is considerable—next to nothing. His hand may occasionally be seen defacing it to suit his special interest, or twisting it here and there in order to render it more suitable to that rigid despotism which he had then determined to impose upon France, but rarely to improve it. The great work of refounding and co-ordinating the Civil Laws of France was ordered by the Constituent Assembly, carried out in great part by the Convention in 1793 and 1795, and then, after revision by Cambacérès, it was submitted to the Council of Five Hundred. Subsequently it was sent for further revision and amendment to all the *tribunaux d'appel* of the Republic, and finally, in a complete form, laid before the *Conseil d'État*. It was at this final stage of its development that it presents the first rude tamperings of Bonaparte. Apart from a few points of detail, that tampering—clearly indicated in the *procès verbaux* which have been preserved—was of a decidedly

detrimental character. The First Consul has therefore no just claim either to the initiation, to the elaboration, or to the amendment, taken in its entirety, of the Civil Code. "When Napoleon attempted to solve legislative problems," says M. Lanfrey, "his acquaintance with the science of law may be estimated as equal in comparative extent to the familiarity with Greek and Latin possessed by the *Médecin malgré lui*."

The peace of Amiens was a mockery. It had no significance save as a breathing-time: a pause absolutely demanded for preparations both civil and military. It was an interlude in which we see Bonaparte assimilating with unscrupulous precipitation the civil administration of France to his own compendious but shallow theory of government: in which we see him arbitrarily determining the internal and external affairs of conterminous states in a manner best suited to accelerate the crowning of the edifice of his own despotism, and to render, in the coming colossal struggle, the action of those States subservient to his own projected movements.\* To heap the whole, or any considerable part, of the vast responsibility incurred by the rupture of the peace of Amiens upon England, is to arrive at an unjust and inconsequent conclusion, halting at a mere mechanical reference to the chronology—the formal sequence—of events. England very wisely anticipated the inevitably near approach of hostilities. She could not witness without justifiable alarm the encroachments of Bonaparte upon the rights and resources of neighbouring nations; and she could not, and would not, tamper with her own liberty merely to soothe the affected sensibility, and gratify the malignity, of a man who was himself the very incarnation of unscrupulosity.

The First Consul added little to his power by assuming imperial appellations, trappings, and environments. "He possessed," says M. Lanfrey, "extraordinary penetration, yet he had no foresight: he was all calculation, yet he was incapable of governing himself."

"An empire he could crush, command, rebuild,  
But govern not his pettiest passion, nor,  
However deeply in men's spirits skilled,  
Look through his own——"

Pandering to a petty and contemptible vanity, Napoleon assented with avidity to the semi-ironical suggestions of Talleyrand, and grandly borrowed many gaudy inanities from the nomenclature and usages pertaining to the old German empire;

---

\* "J'avais formé d'immenses projets; je voulais assurer à la France l'empire du monde!" (Discours de l'Empereur aux Sénateurs, janvier, 1814.)

whilst with feverish haste he resuscitated most of the court formalities, ceremonies, and etiquette, which had been prevalent under the old monarchy of France. *The Emperor of the French*, moreover, could assert a nominal as well as a real equality with the sovereigns of Europe; he could now address an emperor or a king as "our well-beloved good brother!" Whilst irresistibly sneering at such puerile vanity, it should be admitted that the unprecedented rapidity with which the marvellous favours of Fortune were conferred, nay, often thrust, upon Napoleon, would have tried the most robust of mental constitutions. A rapid succession of daring and stupendous bounds hurried him to a summit from which, after the battle of Austerlitz, or at latest after the treaty of Tilsit, he was too mentally giddy to survey with equanimity, and without an inkling of covetousness, the kingdoms of the world which the spirit of the Tempter spread before him. He had begun by identifying himself with France; he now determined to identify France with himself—"La France, c'est un homme, et cet homme, c'est moi." Before this unmatched arrogance of the parvenu Emperor, the pompous assumption of Louis XIV—"L'Etat, c'est moi"—sinks into comparative modesty. Without pity or remorse, Napoleon exhausted and engulfed in reiterated impracticable, because permanently physically overmatched, attempts to reach the depths of his own unfathomable ambition, the life and resources of a nation which had, with prodigal confidence and exuberant acclamations, resigned its future into his keeping. For a brief season, indeed, there existed a dazzling conjuncture of events which gave a fictitious air of substantiality to Napoleon's wildest conceptions. King of kings, and virtually arbiter of Europe, the Emperor of the French dethroned the sovereigns of Bourbon race, and in their stead installed kings selected from the House of Bonaparte. To maintain and extend this extravagant and unnatural supremacy, he trampled without scruple upon every right, remorselessly sacrificed innumerable lives, and spread, with fiendish callousness, a blight over the happiness and prospects of myriads. The numerous elements of weakness which disastrously and often fatally predominated in the counsels and decisions of the depositaries of power in the leading monarchies of Europe favoured his progress, and stimulated the action of his immoderate ambition. Victorious to a degree which probably realized many of his wildest dreams, he arrogantly overbore and insulted all the most fondly-cherished patriotic instincts and sentiments which are inseparably interwoven with every well-defined nationality, and sought forcibly to twist the commercial and political interests of every continental people towards the immediate aggrandizement of France. It was mainly thus that

Napoleon spread the basis of a vast and inevitably increasing opposition to his sway. He had now to contend not against cabinets only, but against peoples ; presumptuously—we may do him the justice to surmise, insanelly—carrying war into the very heart of nature. The issue of the conflict could not be doubtful. It was during the first attempts which he made to rivet a foul usurpation upon the nations of the Peninsula that he was forced, however obdurately implacable, to acknowledge the indomitable and ever-dilating spirit of the antagonist which he had madly challenged. The surprising, and for a time incredible, success which attended the tenacious resistance of the Spaniards to the insolent usurper exercised a powerful revivifying effect upon the less ardent temperament of other oppressed peoples. The battle of Leipzig finally dissolved the imperious spell which for ten years had enthralled Europe. It shook the portentous edifice of the French empire to its lowest foundations, and, in no doubtful accents, heralded to every nation still subject to the arbitrary influence of Napoleon a speedy and complete emancipation.

The man who had deliberately dismissed every suggestion of moderation, and had placed before his mind the unqualified alternative either of achieving the permanent subjugation of Europe or his own destruction, was finally compelled to yield to the gigantic efforts of the enemies he had wantonly created. He had gambled away the lives, happiness, and fortune of millions ; but the very magnitude of the hazard imposed, and still imposes, upon the imagination of the multitude, and indeed upon that of a gross proportion of the well-informed classes ; in-somuch that, even during his lifetime, the arch-immolator of his fellow-creatures was raised to the dignity of a god. Truly, Tallemant des Réaux, contemporary with Louis XIV., was not far wrong when he asserted that “the people reserves its veneration for those who devour it ;” and, yet more justifiably, a modern poet, contemporary with Napoleon, treats it no less contemptuously :—

“ Il aime le tyran qui, dans les champs humides,  
Par milliers fait pourrir les os ;  
Il aime qui lui fait bâtir des pyramides,  
Porter des pierres sur le dos.”

There is much truth in Hallam's remark that “ historians have in general more indulgence for splendid crimes than for the weaknesses of virtue.” This mischievous partiality is notoriously exemplified in most of the narratives which have described the career of the first Napoleon. Faults and even flagitious acts sink into insignificance, or disappear altogether, before the *éclat* which attends conspicuous successes. It is against this indis-

criminating worship of mere success, not against the admiration lavished on the exhibition of really high and brilliant endowments, that we protest. In the character of Napoleon there no doubt commingle, with much that is mean and criminal, many very eminent qualities. It displays numerous contrasts and startling intensities of light and shade. In vain we attempt to ally it with some existing type; it eludes association, and stands alone, as it were in a sort of Arctic solitude where no genial spring or autumn separates the bright but brief summer from the long, dim, pitiless winter.

With but few exceptions among capable judges, Napoleon, as a military leader, is acknowledged to have displayed an ability unsurpassed in modern times. Incompetent properly to handle the materials which are afforded for arriving at a tenable judgment upon the subject, we accept this proximate unanimity of authoritative opinions as conclusive. The wonderful success, moreover, which attended most of Napoleon's campaigns affixes a very significant seal to such a favourable judgment. Nearly all the brilliant and commendable qualities of which the French Emperor could boast were, indeed, either those which are immediately necessary to form a distinguished military leader, or those which serve such primary qualities in the guise of useful auxiliaries. To the genius of a great captain, Napoleon added a wide and yet minutely incisive penetration; a power of concentrating his attention upon a single subject, and yet fully capable of a rapid mobility of mental action; an energy before which even the impossible at times found it difficult to obtain recognition; a remarkably vivid imagination, and a yet more marvellous facility and completeness in most attempts to impress that of others; a deep knowledge of, and a yet deeper contempt for, men; the finesse of the Italian, and the asperity of the Corsican. These useful, and for the most part admirable, endowments were, however, generally rendered either subservient to a selfishness whose exactions were ever insatiable, or ignominiously used as appliances for puffing a vanity whose capacity for inflation was boundless. So dominated by, and saturated with, these latter qualities were the principal acts of Napoleon, that we are constrained to regard them as constituting the main and widely-comprehensive features of his individuality. They are the sources whence flowed nearly every inspiration of his genius; they never failed to obtrude into every proposition and argument submitted to his mind for deliberate consideration, and influenced more or less every decision arrived at by his judgment. Though fully entitled to the highest admiration for the degree of perfection to which he wrought the practical application of the natural gifts with which he was endowed, Napoleon was often

prone in dealing with his fellow men to betray an amount of artificiality so obtrusive as to impair the efficacy of many an otherwise consummate act. In him the histrionic overspread and almost effaced the natural. The great comedian was incapable of masking in a fully effective manner his supercilious and supreme contempt for mankind: his overweening self-conceit betrayed him. His attempts to evoke a convenient magnanimity in his troops by repeated references to Greece and Rome in his early proclamations, the language of justice and virtue which he delighted to use in its purest and most elevated accents, were, with very rare exceptions, mere theatrical affectations. But he wore the mask of lofty feeling and aspiration with such judicious boldness and such ineffable grace that he seldom failed to produce the desired impression upon the mind of the multitude, and to divert the attention even of the select few from the essentially gross and mean character of his own mind. Rarely did he appear before the world except habited in some disguise. His diplomacy, presenting obtrusive reassuring external appearances, was, in reality, a mass of foul fraud, and derived its chief efficacy and motive action from flattery, false assurances, and potent incitements to slumber. Full of feints and surprises, how often would its fair features suddenly change into a hostile front, and in place of conciliation present demands never anticipated! Duplicity was seldom, if ever, altogether absent from any of his public acts. How consummate, for instance, was the skill with which he handled it in his dealings with Venice, with the Helvetic Confederacy, with the King of Spain! With such a marked tendency to make this quality subserve his ends, Napoleon cannot reasonably be expected to afford many indications of possessing true courage, at least in its higher manifestations. That he was deficient at times even in gross physical bravery, what clearer evidence can be demanded than the pusillanimity which he displayed on the 18 Brumaire when confronted by personal danger in the council chamber of the Five Hundred? With such debasing qualities, it is by no means surprising that Napoleon was perfectly ready, at the first solicitation of malice or wounded vanity, to associate despicable meanness: witness his dastardly treatment of Mesdames de Chevreuse, Récamier, de Staël, de Balbi, de Damas, and others. Such special manifestations of contemptible feeling were, moreover, very natural products of the depreciative and essentially Oriental opinion which he entertained of women. Even his love for Joséphine—without doubt real and tepidly constant—succumbed almost mechanically, and certainly with little compunction, before a gratuitous hypothesis based on so-called “reasons of State.” In vain we search the character of Napoleon for indications of unsimulated



susceptibility to any warm or generous feelings. On the other hand, it presents a marvellous compound of subtle artifice and naked brutality, of deliberate systematic persecution and sudden intemperate cruelty. No allusion, it may be observed, is here intended to the latter quality in its colossal aspect, when it assumes a prescriptive right of translation from its literal acceptance to figure in the vocabulary of the conqueror and the vulgar as synonymous with "glory ;"—"glory" unanimously and very justly accorded to the French Emperor, considering that it represents the direct butchery of about two millions of human beings, and, indirectly, probably a surpassingly "glorious" number ;—but to its more determinate individual physiognomy, a physiognomy much too insignificant to be crowned with any the least halo of "glory," and therefore acknowledged by the world to present its real, unadorned, inherently atrocious features. In the superlative infamy to which he carried these qualities, Napoleon probably stands unrivalled. Where can a greater perfection of baseness be exemplified than in his conduct towards Moreau ? What more notable example of perfidy and elaborate persecution can be cited than his treatment of Toussaint l'Ouverture ? When his intended victim was defenceless, as in the case of Palm, the bookseller, he ostentatiously paraded his contempt for justice, and even for the most ordinary dictates of humanity ; but when, as in the case of Pichegru, the conqueror of Holland, there menaced danger to himself, his cowardice counselled the intervention of darkness and stealthy conspiracy. Many other similar cases crowd upon the mind, but no enumeration of such infamies claiming any approach to completeness has been recorded except, peradventure, on the conscience of Napoleon himself, and there, granting that the Imperial culprit possessed such a monitor at all, the traces must have been barely legible. Such summary and bloodthirsty acts formed prominent motive parts in the Autocrat's political system. In his correspondence with his brother Joseph, Napoleon recommends them for imitation with unwearied emphasis, the ever-recurring refrain to all political advice being "*fusillez, fusillez.*" Cemented by an unswerving practical adhesion to this compendious precept "*fusillez,*" "*conscire* and "*proscire* constituted the first and last words of the Imperial régime."

In the *Mercure de France* of July 6, 1807, there was hazarded a prediction which M. Lanfrey has worthily and eloquently fulfilled.

"The time is not far distant," says Chateaubriand,—for he was the prophet,—“when the historian shall reveal in the deified tyrant the features of the mountebank, the incendiary, and the parricide—a revelation analogous to that made by many a primitive Christian of Egypt,

who, penetrating at the peril of his life into the temples of idolatry, forced from its lurking place in the inner penetralia of the dark sanctuary the divinity to which fear was constrained to offer incense, and, instead of a god, dragged into the light of day some horrible monster."



## ART. VII.—THE MIGRATION OF LABOUR.

UNDER the term migration has been generally designated that readjustment and equi-balancing of the home labour market, which might perhaps be more properly indicated by the expression circulation of labour. In addition, however, to its connexion with the subject in the popular mind, the term migration has certain etymological advantages about it, as wound round the association of circumstances and ideas, which brings the question to the front at the present time. For though the migration of labour is an old subject, the revival of interest in it at the present time is less owing to efforts made with the direct object of procuring a healthy circulation of labour *in* England, than it is to a phase through which the subject of emigration *out of* England has passed. For a long time past we have been accustomed to hear the depressed condition of the English labour market dilated upon; philanthropists and good people engaged in the work of charity among the poor, have been continually calling the attention of the public to deep and appalling distress to which they have been themselves witness; the approximate cause of this distress being want of employment. This want of employment has been supposed specially to characterize the modern epoch, and has been usually attributed to a redundancy of population. Those who hazard this opinion have to confront the deductions of economic science, as well as the fact of the increase in the general prosperity of the country; for it is an undoubted fact that the increase of population has been accompanied by a larger proportionate increase of capital; and according to all the rules of political economy, the condition of the labourer ought, under these circumstances, to have improved rather than retrograded. Nor are there wanting numerous indications that this is the case. Competition has been largely stimulated, the wages of labour have risen, and there can be little doubt that the condition of the British workman has on the whole improved. But it does not follow that this measure of prosperity may not be badly dis-

tributed, and that it may not have a tendency to gravitate to particular centres, leaving beyond its pale atoms of poverty and wretchedness in a more miserable plight than ever. And this fact, which, like all the modifications introduced under the head of distribution, is popularly taken too little account of in applying the deductions of economic science, reconciles the apparently contrary facts which have been observed, and proves the actual phenomena to be in accordance with the theory of political economy. But granting that this is so, the question still remains, Whether a bad distribution of labour be a special characteristic of modern times; and if so, whether it be, as is frequently assumed, a consequence of modern civilization? Now when we speak of a distribution of labour or its own rewards, we mean either that which is personal (between man and man), or that which is geographical (between one locality and another). A defective distribution of the first description, by which one workman obtains an excessive share of labour and its rewards while his next door neighbour starves for want of employment, opens up a discussion which is foreign to the subject of this article. This evil, which some have sought to cure by attempting to equalize the wages of labour without reference to that labour's worth, can alone be removed by raising the standard of worth of those lowest in the scale of labour; by in fact the extension of education; and though we are deplorably backward in this respect, it cannot be said that modern civilization has decreased the means of education. Upon the local distribution of labour, the question with which we have to deal, the effect of modern science and appliances has been still more obviously upon the side of movement. A network of railways has supplied means of intercommunication between the various parts of the country, of a speed, cheapness, and security hitherto unknown; while the newspaper press, pushed forward with the most untiring enterprise, carries home the tools of intelligence to the remotest corners of the land.

Modern civilization has then had entirely an opposite effect to that so often attributed to it; and so far from being chargeable with the want of employment which exists, may be shown to have really conduced largely to its reduction. But if the evils complained of be not attributable to modern progress and civilization, but are, on the contrary, maintained in spite of them, the only conclusion at which we can arrive is that they have not been sufficiently extended. So far from having moved forward, as it is asserted, too fast, it is evident that we have not progressed fast enough, and that the pulse of the age beats a quicker movement still. And it is by no means a discouraging feature of the times in which we live that this is being increas-

ingly felt. The age is self-accusative in its honest desire for improvement; and the ills and maladies of the social body are no longer nursed and cherished as they used to be in holes and corners, but are dragged out to the light for the specific treatment of science. It is a necessary feature however of this state of things, that the horrors of the disease being for the first time realized, it should be looked upon as a new malady, or as a more virulent form of an old one.

This is especially the case with reference to the circulation of labour. There is no doubt, as in times past, there has been want of employment directly owing to a defective circulation of labour. It is not for us to under-estimate the consequences, direct and indirect, of this evil, for they are very great. Still the tendency is for it to diminish rather than to increase, but at so slow a rate that, relatively, it appears to be stationary, if not on the increase. The instincts of the age then are right when it presses for a remedy. And yet we cannot but allow that, whatever want of employment may be attributable to the want of a healthy circulation of labour, a far larger portion of it is immediately due to personal disabilities in the labourers themselves. The causes of this, however, it is not our object at the present time to discuss. They are being investigated by degrees, and in a manner more hopeful of progress than the most sanguine of economists would have anticipated a few years ago. Before, however, the present direction was given to opinion on this subject, those who were interested in the question were content, for the most part, to deal only with the symptoms of the disease. Want of employment, and terrible want too, was observed; and the question was how to remedy the immediate evil. About a quarter of a century ago, that grand movement of the English and Saxon races known as the emigration movement may be said to have reached an epoch in its history. The resources of the United States, both in land and minerals, were developing with unparalleled rapidity. This, coupled with the reports of the gold diggings in California, followed quickly by the discoveries of the same precious metal in the Australian colonies, gave a stimulus to emigration the full tide of which has only now been reached. The accounts received as to the demand for labour in the new countries, then, as it were, suddenly thrown open to the world's capital and the world's labour, were such as to direct all eyes to them. Here at least was employment for all, and here all were welcome. What wonder then that the conclusion should be arrived at—especially by those who could not stomach the strong meat of the doctrines of Malthus—that in emigration was a complete cure for the evil known as want of employment? Accordingly, from this period we may date the era of emigration

societies. The number of them has been continually increasing, and their operations have been extending in all directions. As charities (and our observations are confined to the charitable societies, and do not extend to the self-supporting clubs) they are regarded by their promoters, as they were by the public (and by a portion of the public still are), as an immense success. The outside features of their work are well known. Crowds of "unemployed" may be seen buzzing round this comparatively new hive of charity. The public are shown large rooms full of them. Enthusiastic meetings are held, and resolutions are unanimously passed in favour of emigration, at other people's expense, if not at the expense of the State. The sceptical are called upon to witness the pitiful plight and the entreaties of those who wish to go, as well as to read the glowing description of their prospects, contained in letters received from those who have gone; and then the supporters of the movement turn round and appeal to the charitable with double confidence. Such has been and is the way of the emigration cure; and for a long time its popularity was unquestionable: now, however, it is distinctly on the wane. Slowly and by degrees other ideas have made their way in men's minds; and emigration, as a cure for what is popularly known as want of employment, has broken its own back. What the causes are which have brought about this result it is not hard to trace. The emigration societies are so managed that, where the emigration is not free, those who are to receive their benefits pay as a rule from one-quarter to one-third of their passages. Being usually unable, or unwilling, to pay this themselves, they go round to the clergymen, the district visitors, or any charitable persons they know of, and solicit their aid. The charitable public have gradually found out what a burden this system entails. They have first to subscribe to the emigration agencies, and then to answer the individual applications for emigration purposes that are continually made upon them. Being thus doubly mulcted, the costliness of the emigration system has been brought home to the most unreasoning minds. At the same time, fuller information, both from the colonies and from the States, has brought to light the fact that all there is not of the same rosy hue for the interests of labour that it undoubtedly was twenty years ago. Reports too have been received as to a wrong class of emigrants having been from time to time sent out by the emigration societies; and it has been broadly stated that many of the dependent class here have only passed to the other side of the ocean to swell the lists of dependents there. Meanwhile, for the last eighteen months or more, there having been a complete and active revival of trade in England, and mineral and textile operations being extended in

all directions, more especially in the north, it became known that there is a more or less active demand for labour in England. Seeing this, sensible people began to argue against the folly of spending vast sums in the emigration of those who could so readily procure employment at home. To spend many pounds, in addition to undertaking a large amount of trouble and canvassing, in sending a man out to America, or to the colonies, as a charity, when the same number of shillings would carry him to a field of full employment in England, was too wasteful a procedure, and one too repugnant to English common sense, to be long entertained. Accordingly, through the unexplored mazes of the larger problem of the circulation of labour over the world's surface, the minds of men have at length been drawn to the study of the much smaller, though, so far as the relief of distress and the stimulating of industry are concerned, much more useful problem of the circulation of labour over our home islands.

Such is the origin of the revival of public interest in the migration of labour. There is no doubt that the interest is a growing one, the subject affecting all classes of the community and all interests. It is a subject which it is impossible to treat of without incurring the accusation of indefiniteness; for it belongs to that numerous class for the resolution of which no absolutely new elements have to be introduced, but the more difficult task has to be undertaken of organizing the elements at present in existence. The questions of organization are peculiarly of our day. In the problems of modern life—more especially life in our large towns—this is the one want which is being increasingly felt. Our great and teeming population seems to be outgrowing its clothes, as Mr. Carlyle would say. It seems to be getting beyond the provision hitherto made for its right ordering. And as one of its wants after another crops up, the conviction gains strength that it will not do to leave things so much to chance and the *laissez-faire* principle as we have done hitherto; and that in fact we must be prepared to face the future with more method, more order, more organization. But the feeling after organization is as yet in its germ, and is so indefinite in the minds of all of us, that it is impossible to give any very definite form to proposals for its satisfaction.

The utmost then that we shall hope to do is to lay before the reader a few thoughts and suggestions which may not be, it is hoped, altogether devoid of interest. It has already been shown that advancing civilization is not the cause of want of employment. The question still remains, Whether, as an absolute fact, the country is at the present time overstocked with labour? Whether, that is to say, in spite of the strides made in civilization and prosperity, employment be difficult to obtain in England,

comparatively to the rest of the world? This question is one upon which very decided views are held either way. It is impossible to decide it without an amount of information which is not at the command of the present writer. The most reliable information upon it would probably be obtained from intelligent members of the working classes. Some interesting reports upon the condition of things in France (in that country's full tide of material prosperity) were published by the Society of Arts at the time of the International Exhibition in Paris in 1867. Mr. Coningsby's report on the condition of employment in the large towns of the United States contains also much instructive matter, and much that took many persons by surprise. It is to be regretted that there is not more of this species of information forthcoming. The general tendency of these reports has been to show that the English skilled labourer's material position compares favourably with that of the Continental, and not always unfavourably with that of the American workman. Then the reports on pauperism furnish us with another gauge of the state of industry abroad. The extent to which this weed of the old country has rooted itself and spread, both in America and in the colonies, is certainly very noteworthy. Still there is, so far as the New World is concerned, a strong array of facts the other way; and the question is very intricate, and further information is, as has been before observed, required for its elucidation. Nor is it necessary for the purposes of the present paper that it should be decided either way. The fact which concerns us at present is that whether the English labour market be or be not overstocked, the labour of the country certainly is badly distributed. There is depression in the labour market in some parts of the country, while there is inflation in others. We have at the present moment the spectacle of industrial operations crippled and starved by a dearth of labour, while in other parts of the country labourers competent to do the work are suffering from want of employment. The situation is very peculiar; for notwithstanding the comparative facilities for locomotion our railway system supplies, these local inequalities in the labour market continue for years and years, the workmen in the depressed localities not migrating to the prosperous parts in sufficient numbers, or with sufficient rapidity to equalize the market. In proof of this statement we may instance the position of agricultural labour. From a return of "the average weekly earnings of agricultural labourers in England and Wales" for the first half of the year 1870 (printed by the House of Commons in April last), it appears that agricultural wages vary from 8s. to 9s. per week at the lowest, to 16s. to 18s. at the highest, or exactly 100 per cent. If we take Wales alone, the variation in wages

is from 8s. to 9s. to 15s. And these inequalities exist while at the same time the amount of labour expected from the labourers, as well as the cost of living, does not vary in favour of the localities where the lower rate of wage prevails, but rather the reverse. Another striking instance of this fact is supplied from a comparison of the conditions of the female labour market in London and the towns of Lancashire. Female labour is, as is well known, at a positive discount in London. In Lancashire it is at a premium. There is actually more demand for female and juvenile than there is for adult male labour: many thousands of looms being reported to be lying idle merely from want of female and juvenile hands to work them. While such is the condition of things in Lancashire, this very class of labour is so depressed in London that the number of widows alone who are in receipt of out-door relief in the metropolis is, according to the last report of the Poor-law Board, 9968; and these have 23,928 children dependent on them. Putting the number roughly at 10,000 families, it may be estimated that each one of these could on an average earn (where not physically incapacitated) from 10s. to 15s. a week in the cotton mills of Lancashire;\* while many large and industrious families would earn from 30s. to 40s. That this state of things is economically unhealthy all will allow. Unfortunately the social evils of it do not appear on the surface. ●Wherever labour is congested—take for example some parts of the east of London—there ignorance and recklessness are sure to prevail. Improvident marriages are a continuing result, as they are a cause of the depression. The population in such localities increases in a larger ratio than where there is industrial activity; and thus the mischief progresses at a compound rate. And this again attracts to itself another evil. Reckless parents are careless of, even if they are conscious of, the interests of their children. The children consequently in such a community as we are contemplating grow into men and women unfitted, both morally and physically, for steady industry. An outcry is apt to be raised as soon as the miserable condition of such a population becomes known. Alms are poured into the district, the dependence of the people increases, and more misery ensues. The only way to deal with these evils effectually is to sap them at their root, by bringing about a better distribution of labour. There is yet another reason why efforts should be made in this

---

\* As to the details of the rate of wages at present current in the cotton mills, and generally as to the condition of the Lancashire labour market, the reader will glean some interesting particulars in a short letter originally published in the *Parochial Critic*, and since republished in a pamphlet form by Mr. Alsager Hay Hill, procurable at 59, Greek Street, Soho.



direction. It is this, that by this means the plea of want of employment would be to a large extent taken away from the idle and the hangers-on on charity. There is no more common or more specious excuse in the mouth of the mendicant and the sluggard than that of his inability to procure employment. The allegation is so difficult to disprove that it may be generally made with the most absolute security from detection, as well as the certainty of commiseration if not of assistance. The extent to which the poor themselves are the victims of this kind of imposture is a proof of this. If any one should know whether the statement that a man could not procure employment were true it is the working class. And yet these are the most ready to fall a prey to the habitual mendicant, who, not having done a stroke of work for years, nor intending to do so, dresses up in a low lodging-house; plays the part, at a suitable season of the year, of the working man out of employment; and collects more from the coppers of the poor in poor neighbourhoods than he does from the alms of the rich. Even persons who pride themselves upon not giving alms to beggars, and would feel themselves insulted were it supposed that they would listen to appeals made to them by strangers in the streets, are very apt to be deluded by this kind of statement when made to them at the poor man's home; more especially when on investigation it is found that those making it are actually out of work. "The poor fellow really cannot find anything to do," they argue, forgetting that the "cannot find" is, so far as the facts before them are concerned, a new term, and one which they have not verified, and it is ordinarily impossible for them to verify. Applicants for charity are well aware of this, and do not fail to take advantage of it accordingly. The present writer has known singular instances of this kind of thing. Having been the means of impressing upon some benevolent individuals the necessity of finding out the truth of such statements, persons making them have occasionally been sent to his door with the request that he would obtain employment for them. The manner and gesture of such have often shown that they looked upon this in the light of a test—a formality to be gone through—and that their sole object was, by putting every difficulty in the way of any employment that might be suggested, to prove that nothing remained for them but relief in one form or another—often emigration. This hidden intention will occasionally crop up to the surface. We recollect a remarkable instance of this in the case of a shipwright, who could have procured employment with ease in the north of England, or even probably in London itself; putting his request in a negative form, he introduced himself as having been sent round by the ladies for the purpose of our satisfying them that there was

*not* employment for him in England—a pretty bold affirmation for a private individual with limited means of knowledge to be required to make.

But to return to the subject in hand. Our object in stimulating the migration of labour should be to promote its freest possible circulation; so that no pair of hands need have cause for idleness on account of want of employment, at the same time that their labour is required in other parts of the country. The result of such a circulation of labour would be more or less to equalize wages all the kingdom over, and those who, whether from the employers or from the workman's point of view, are inimical to this result, will be of course adverse to any efforts made in the migration of labour. Let all be prepared for the result. A freer circulation of labour means increased competition amongst labourers, as well as amongst employers of labour. It means the opening up of the labour market, both on the side of capital and on the side of labour. It means the breaking down of monopolies—both the monopolies of capital, favoured by a local congestion of labour; and the monopolies of cliques of workmen, locally banded together to the exclusion of their fellows. It means finally, a direct gain both to capital and labour by saving the waste at present incurred when each fails to meet with the other. The primary essential is evidently some system of labour registration. The kind of chance intelligence with regard to labour which is alone, as a general rule, procurable at present, may do very well when the labour and employment are not locally removed from each other. One workman tells another that a job is going, he tells a third, and in this way the fact becomes known in the neighbourhood; but certainly not out of the neighbourhood. Nor will employers in most trades, however much in want of hands, advertise to any great extent in the ordinary newspapers. The reasons for this are certainly sufficiently obvious; and if they were not, the fact remains, and it is with that we are concerned. Unless labour be locally obtainable, the time which, even under the most favourable circumstances, elapses before suitable labourers can be procured causes considerable inconvenience as well as positive loss to the employers.

On the other hand, a labourer looking for work outside of his own immediate neighbourhood is in a still worse position. He has usually no reliable means of procuring information as to the state of the labour market. Moreover his labour cannot, like the employer's capital, wait; so that if he be unable to obtain employment in his own immediate neighbourhood, he is usually obliged either to start on tramp in perfect uncertainty as to whither he should bend his steps, or else to stop at home, becoming gradually

demoralized, and even in many cases ultimately dependent; while all the time there may be in other parts of the country a demand for his labour. It is true that, in this matter of labour registration, the Trade Societies have done good service; but as the operation of these Societies is partial and limited, extending only over a small portion of the labouring classes of the country, and as they have not the confidence of capitalists—an element of great importance in the spread of reliable information—something more than they supply seems to be needed. Looking to the helplessness of ordinary labourers in this matter, as well as to the fact that the Poor Law undertakes, in the ultimate resort, the support of labourers rendered destitute by want of employment, many persons have been of opinion that the Poor Law system should be made to supply a means of labour registration. The proposal has some advantages about it, and is at first sight somewhat taking; and, in the absence of any more suitable agency, probably some good might be done by utilizing the machinery of the Poor Law for this purpose. That almost any other agency, however, would be preferable will, we apprehend, be the verdict of those who are much acquainted with the working of the Poor Law system. It is an undoubted fact that going to the offices of the Poor Law, for almost any purpose, is demoralizing to workmen, as tending to familiarize them with parish relief, and to make them candidates for it at some future time. Moreover the very name of the Poor Law stinks in the nostrils of industry. It is so connected with semi-vicious idleness and incompetency, that employers would, we fear, never under ordinary circumstances be induced to avail themselves of its machinery to obtain labour. But rejecting the Poor Law on these practical grounds, it must not be supposed that we endorse the view which is often maintained as conclusive against a registration through its agency—viz., that the registration of labour is not a matter of national concern. It seems to us, on the contrary, that it is; and that it is so upon the same principle that education and provident institutions are so; and, like both of these, it should certainly be established on a self-supporting, and not on a relief, basis. The difficulty is to hit upon any existing department of Government suitable for the work. Neither the Poor Law, the Post Office, nor the Police seems to be a satisfactory agency. Of these three, however, the Post Office seems greatly preferable. Its connexion with the Government provident institutions, as well as its disassociation from dependence or crime, give it an advantage over the other two departments. But the savings bank and insurance business, which is the link which would bind a system of labour registration to the Post Office, is itself only remotely connected

with the Post Office work proper; and as one business after another is heaped upon this very elastic department, it becomes more and more evident that there will have to be ultimately some definite subdivision of its work. The money business will have in fact to be erected into a distinct department. There seems to be no assignable limit to the extent to which the State may, in this country, become the bankers and insurers for the community. It may certainly be looked upon as a prospective fact, that a system of benefit societies will be tacked on to the present system of Post Office provident institutions. When this is the case, and the savings bank business has extended to the extent to which it most assuredly will, the need of a separate department of State to take up the whole of this business will become still more evident. To the work of such a department, the management of registers of labour would be specially germane. But having said so much, it would be folly to attempt to sketch out the details of such a system of labour registration. There should be a travelling fund attached to the system, enabling workmen to lay by small sums of money for travelling expenses, to be held upon similar conditions to deposits in the savings banks; and if ever the time should come when the English railways will be more directly under State control, workmen holding deposits in such travelling fund might very properly be passed to their destination at reduced fares.

Leaving the subject of labour registration, it will be as well now to proceed to consider the more immediate question of how, under existing circumstances, the migration of labour may be stimulated, the difficulties of space overcome, and labour and capital in different parts of the country brought more readily together. The problem is this: given workmen requiring work, and employers, in other parts of the country, requiring labourers, how may the passage of the latter to the fields of labour be facilitated? In considering this question, we must not allow ourselves to be carried forward, in imagination, into the future, to a time when the spread of provident habits, together with a better equilibrium of the forces of society, shall have placed working men in a position to meet this, and almost any other contingency, and when the caustic of education shall have eaten away those too local predilections, which are often in the way at present, but we must take things as we find them.

If an employer could feel assured that any particular workman in another part of the country were of the requisite skill, and that he could rely upon the travelling expenses being duly repaid to him, as well as upon the workman considering himself bound to stay with him for such a length of time as would repay the trouble that had been taken on his part, he would, if he wanted

the man's labour, find it well worth his while to advance the requisite amount of money. Unfortunately the experience of capitalists in this matter has been at times very discouraging, for it cannot be denied that experiments connected with the migration of labour have in some cases failed through want of complete honesty on the part of workmen. It is a melancholy though natural result, that the whole of the working class suffers through the want of strict integrity on the part of some of their number. Having, however, found out this evil, it would be well if it were more fully recognised, and if the attention of philanthropists were in consequence more directed to the subject of character, helping poor and distressed labourers of really good character and industry to substantiate that character before employers. The societies for organizing charity and repressing mendicity, which are now spreading a regular network of machinery throughout the country, might for the time being act as useful mediators in this respect between distressed workmen and employers of labour. Nor should such societies be discouraged by the mere fact that charity has got, and deservedly, a bad reputation in this matter. But the consciousness of this should exercise a wholesome restraint upon the giving of rash recommendations, and exercising a species of philanthropy at the expense of others which is too common. The habit has too frequently been for charitable individuals to plead the cause of the distressed, and to recommend them to employers of labour without a full inquiry into the character and antecedents, and the cause of want of employment in each case. And even where the weak points or delinquencies of the *protégé* are known, the practice has been and is to conceal them, and thus to try and obtain employment for the man under false pretences.

Doubtless such pious frauds have their origin in a benevolent motive—viz., that of giving the miserable, even though they may have faulty characters, one more chance in life; but the perpetrators of them should remember that they have no right to make employers of labour and others perform charitable acts in disguise. The consequences, moreover, of this practice are fatal to the operations of true charity. Employers soon find out that they have been deceived, and decline any longer to take the recommendations of the charitable. It is the part of true philanthropists to strive, by exercising the greatest stringency in investigating into character, as well as the utmost honesty in their statements of it, to rid charity of this bad reputation. Not that charity should withdraw her hand from the weak, the sinning, and the frail. To lift up the fallen and reinstate them into a position of honest industry, is indeed the noblest work of charity. But it should not be attempted on the sly, or in the

dark. And those who by taking the frail into their employ are doing one of the greatest acts of charity we can conceive of, have a right to a full disclosure of the facts of each case, in order that they may know what they are about. An instance of this system being successfully pursued is supplied by the Discharged Prisoners' Aid Society. Every employer who takes into his service a discharged prisoner recommended by that society has full notice of the fact that he was a prisoner. Private employers in the more prosperous districts might do much good by promoting the immigration of labourers from less favoured parts of the country. This has been done, and is being done, in various cases, with more or less success. At the meeting of the Social Science Association at Newcastle-on-Tyne in the autumn of last year, some interesting particulars as to the introduction of labourers to their works were given by some of the chief employers of labour in the north of England. It cannot be concealed that those who are engaged in im-migrating labourers must be prepared to meet with some hostility from their own workmen, while those who are helping forward the e-migration of such labourers will certainly provoke the opposition of local employers. Nothing would make a man more unpopular probably among the farmers in such counties as Dorsetshire, Devonshire and Suffolk than for him to be known to be engaged in making arrangements for the migration of the surplus agricultural labour there to the northern counties; and it seems probable that nothing would be more likely to bring about a strike among the Lancashire operatives than for manufacturers to introduce labour from London to anything like an appreciable extent. Still this dislike is, in both cases, the result of a narrow exclusiveness, if not of an economic fallacy; for probably a full inquiry would show that the result would not be, in either case, really detrimental to the interests involved. And whether this were so or not, it is surely not unreasonable to expect that with increasing knowledge and the more complete cohesion of the social elements wider views will prevail, and the good of the whole community will so largely override in the public estimation the supposed benefits or detriment to particular classes or interests, that less will be thought of the outcries against progress raised by local protectionists.

With regard to the Poor Law. Though for the reason above given it does not seem to be a suitable agency for the registration of labour, still, as the circulation of labour most nearly affects, as has been shown, the question of pauperism, the Poor Law should, in its own department of dealing with paupers and unemployed labourers who have become chargeable to the rates, make greater efforts than it does to rid itself of the burden of

their relief by procuring them employment. The importance to the Poor Law guardians of their having it in their power to test applicants for relief, as well as to reduce the numbers on the pauper roll, by the offer of real work outside the workhouse, is so obvious that it is needless to dilate on it here. At present the system of labour-tests in operation at the workhouses is usually so transparent a sham—as far as real labour is concerned—that where the workhouse test is not enforced there is but little limit to the number of labourers of the most idle and worthless class who may come on the rates for support. In London, for instance, the offer of really hard work would more than half clear our metropolitan stoneyards. And it is notorious that there are many instances on record, as well as others constantly occurring, where paupers have refused wages varying from 12s. to 20s. a week. And where the workhouse test is in force, and idle men and women are congregated in the workhouses, it is equally if not more essential that the guardians should have some means of discovery as to whether, as a matter of fact, such in-door paupers could or could not earn their living outside; for it is a delusion to suppose that the horror of the workhouse is by any means a universal feeling among this class of persons, and that the mere application consequently of the “house” test is sufficient of itself to keep off the pauper roll all who can earn a living outside the workhouse walls.

A system of labour registration and migration would be consequently an invaluable assistance to the Poor Law guardians. As, however, employers cannot be expected to assist in the work of testing the industry of the pauper class, and as paupers are manifestly unable to defray the cost themselves, it is clear that if they have to be moved to fields of labour for this purpose, the expense of their migration must necessarily fall upon the rates. Some interesting experiments in this matter were tried immediately after the introduction of the new Poor Law. It will be remembered that under the old Poor Law system labour had become so disorganized, so localized, and so congested, that migration seemed to be a most fitting and necessary step to the bringing about of a better state of things. Accordingly it was tried, and with very excellent results; many labourers being migrated at the expense of the rates from the southern and purely agricultural counties to the manufacturing districts in the north.

Interesting particulars with regard to that migration are to be found in the second annual report of the Poor Law Commissioners. The reader of that report cannot fail to be struck by the similarity of the inequalities in the various local labour markets which it discloses, when compared with that which exists in the present day.

"The Poor Law Commissioners for England and Wales have received information," says a circular letter of the Commissioners in 1835, "from the manufacturing districts, that in those districts there are now frequent demands for the labour of families comprehending children of the proper age and strength for employment. . . . The families most eligible [for migration] will be those of widows with the greatest proportion of grown-up children."

And this exactly describes the state of things in 1872. The thirty-seven years seem to have made no appreciable difference in the relative conditions of the labour market in the north and south of England. The stagnation, with the exception perhaps of the metropolis, was in precisely the same parts of the country, and in the same employments that it is now, while the demand was in the same localities that it is at present. Leaving this, so far as we are aware, solitary experiment of the Poor Law in the migration of labour, it will be found that later on it was directly discouraged. At the present time, in fact, the guardians are prohibited by law from paying the expenses of the migration of labour. The mind of the law seems to be in much the same condition as that from which the English public is just emerging, for while it prohibits migration it sanctions the emigration of workmen at the expense of the rates. There are certain conditions attached to this permission, and when these have been complied with—and they are for the most part formal—no less a sum than 2*l.* per head may be expended for that purpose. Owing to the vigilance of local guardians this wasteful provision has been seldom acted upon; but its existence, when contrasted with the prohibition of the infinitely less costly and more practical remedy of migration, is a great anomaly in our Poor Law legislation. On this point we may hear with advantage the wisdom of our predecessors.

"In our last annual report," say the Commissioners in 1836, "we stated our reasons for believing that the apparent amount of surplus labour was unreal and factitious; and consequently that the permanent domiciliation in a workhouse of any large number of agricultural labourers—a fear which was in those days present to the minds of many as a possible result of the introduction of the workhouse system—was the result we least contemplated. In the case of any real surplus being found to exist, we announced our intention of endeavouring to provide for it, either by emigration to some of our colonies, or by migration to some home district in which an active demand for labour might be found to prevail. In conformity with the intentions thus expressed, we have thought it necessary to enable many parishes in the south-eastern districts of England, particularly in Norfolk, Suffolk, and parts of Wiltshire, where a redundancy of labourers was most complained of, to raise funds for the conveyance of numerous emigrants, who have proceeded chiefly to Toronto, in Upper Canada. In



this matter, however, we have acted only in compliance with the wishes of the parishioners; we have taken no steps to encourage or promote this costly method of relief. We have exerted ourselves more directly, however, in encouraging the migration of paupers to the manufacturing districts. Some of the individuals who have gone in search of employment, having been inured from their childhood to parish pay and the reckless, loitering life which an habitual dependence on it invariably gives rise to, have failed to acquire regular and industrious habits, and have returned to their former homes; but it is satisfactory to us to be able to state that our efforts have on the whole been attended with success."

It is not difficult to understand the grounds upon which the power to migrate labourers has been interdicted to the guardians. Doubtless the system is obnoxious to gross abuses—local boards sending away their worst and most idle and troublesome paupers, to the great annoyance and expense of the unions into which such paupers are migrated, and to the ultimate expense probably of other unions—viz., those of settlement—in which the paupers may not have resided for years and years; but these abuses might be guarded against to a large extent by legislative provision, while at the same time the very great advantages of the system might be allowed full play. The measure best adapted to secure the desired end would seem to be:—

1. That in all cases where paupers are migrated by the guardians, due notice of such migration should be sent to the union into which the paupers are introduced, accompanied with a full description of such paupers.
2. That the fact of a board of guardians migrating a pauper should give a settlement to that pauper in the union so migrating him.

The effect of this latter provision would be that, where a migrated pauper became dependent before he had gained the status of irremovability (*i.e.*, one year at least), he would be chargeable to the union from which he had been migrated—a consequence that would tend to make boards of guardians very careful whom they sent away into other unions. Under some such conditions the guardians might probably be permitted to migrate pauper labourers, with the most beneficial results to the community at large. It is not to be expected, however, that the scheme should escape much adverse criticism. It will be looked upon doubtless by many persons as objectionable, as permitting one board of guardians to trench, as it may be considered, somewhat upon the ground of another. It is to be hoped that such an objection would not be allowed to prevail. The sentiments that prompt it—a selfish exclusion on the one side, and the fear of stirring up local jealousies on the other—are among the greatest hindrances in the way of the general adoption of enlightened and compre-

hensive schemes for the treatment of pauperism, and indeed of all questions of local self-government. The want of cohesion is the cardinal weakness of our local government system. Those who wish to impart strength to that system, and to save the country from centralization, will do well to look to this matter. The retention of local self-government, in the fullest sense of the term, is one thing; the maintenance of the present isolation amongst the local bodies is quite another thing. The distribution of the labour of the country is just one of those questions of national concern which merely local interests should not be allowed to interfere with.

There is, however, a general objection to all schemes for encouraging the migration of labour, which should be considered before concluding this article. A fear is present to the minds of many, lest by stimulating the migration of labour we should only be helping to promote vagrancy. It cannot be affirmed that this apprehension is upon the face of it altogether groundless; and yet when we come to investigate a little deeper into the matter, it will appear pretty evident that the effect will be precisely the reverse to that which is apprehended. There is a great deal of profitless tramping about the country at the present time, precisely because there is no system of labour registration, and a labourer is unable to obtain reliable information as to the conditions of the local labour markets. This tramping should not be for one moment confounded with vagrancy; but at the same time, it is not to be denied that vagrancy does occasionally spring out of it. The honest workman who starts afoot in search of work—and it is literally a search, for he has usually the very remotest clue as to where it is likely to be found—has so many difficulties to contend with, while he is at the same time exposed to so many temptations to take to a life of mendicancy, and has his energies so sapped by the disappointments he meets with, and the misdirected exertions he makes, that the only marvel is, not that he does occasionally, but that he does not frequently, succumb and fall away into vagrancy; and it speaks a world for the independence of the English working men that this is so. Now a system of labour registration and migration would to a great extent do away with the tramping system. It would moreover have another important effect in the direction of checking vagrancy, by the cutting off of indiscriminate charity. It would take out of the mouth of the sluggard and the habitual vagrant the excuse—the most telling one that can be put forward—that he is a poor man on tramp, in search for work which he cannot find. To conclude, we are living in an age when the ordinary spread of information, however imperfect that information may be, is inducing, and happily so, a certain amount of

restlessness amongst the labouring classes. This restlessness may be turned to good account by a wise determination to spread true and reliable information as to the condition of the labour market all over the country ; or it may be allowed to fester into a species of vagrancy. It is a happy thing that there is the restlessness that there is, for where it does not exist (as in some of the agricultural districts as well as among some species of labourers in the large towns) we are face to face with an infinitely greater evil—viz., the stagnation of labour, perhaps the most pregnant of the evils that find their outcome in pauperism.



#### ART. VIII.—THE QUESTION OF RACE IN FRANCE.

1. *Mémoires de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris.* Tomes i. ii. Paris. 1860-5.
2. *Bulletins de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris.* I. Série. Tomes i.-vi., II. Série, i.-iv. Paris.
3. *Ethnogenie Gauloise.* Par ROGET BON DE BELLOQUET. Tomes i. ii. Paris. 1861.
4. *Histoire de la Langue Française.* Par E. LITTRE. Tomes i. ii. Paris. 1869.

FRANCE, regarded in the light of her scenery and produce, has been termed the Epitome of Europe, and not without some show of reason. The rich meadows of Artois and Picardy recall the Netherlands. Lorraine resembles (only too fatally) the Rhenine provinces of which a portion of her territory forms now a part. The uplands of Franche Comté, studded with dairy farms, and backed by the Jura range, are suggestive of Switzerland. In Normandy, the Englishman finds the chalk-streams and thatched cottages of his own southern counties ; in Britany, the wolds of Yorkshire. Provence, with her olive, fig, and mulberry trees and fragrant shrubs, with the orange groves and palm trees of her Hyères and Cannes, with her bright clear atmosphere and the blue Mediterranean washing her shores, recalls that Italy which Pliny said she really was ; while the vine-clad valley of the Garonne—as much the Garden of France as Touraine herself—and Roussillon, the land of the almond, peach, and apricot, resemble, while they surpass in fertility, the neighbouring provinces of Spain.

This variety in the scenery and produce is accompanied by a variety in the population of France. The differences which exist amongst Frenchmen in the matter of moral and physical

characteristics are, indeed, so marked that none can fail to observe them. Morally, the stubborn Breton differs widely from the Provençal of quick and lively temperament; and physically, the low-statured Auvergnât and Limousin from the well-built athletic Norman, and from their nearer neighbours of the Côte d'Or; while in both respects, the Basque stands wholly by himself amongst his fellow-countrymen. If we turn from casual observation to the more trustworthy evidence of statistics, we obtain, together with the confirmation of our impressions, a mass of information as reliable as it is interesting. To take the matter of longevity: in this respect the Normans rank considerably above the average of Frenchmen generally, and their neighbours the Bretons in particular. On the other hand, the Bretons are as conspicuous for their immunity from, as the natives of Provence—its seaboard alone excepted—for their liability to, consumptive complaints, and weak or short vision. The Franche-Comtois possess the reputation of surpassing every other set of provincials in the number of pupils they send to the Ecole Polytechnique in Paris, and of having furnished a large and distinguished contingent to the ranks of jurists, critics, and mathematicians. In these and many other respects does France, when statistically mapped out, present a varied appearance.

Yet with all this variety in physique and temperament we must still acknowledge that a type, physical and moral, characterizes the French as a people. It is one we naturally associate with them; one which, in its moral aspect, the events of the last eighteen months have, spite of a few instances to the contrary, served to bring out, and to contrast sharply with the no less characteristic type of their near neighbours and late opponents on the battle-field. If we ask how has this type been formed? we cannot deny that as far as it is moral, it may in a measure be indebted to political and social influences, and that as far as it is physical, equally in a measure to hygienic conditions; but as the first class of circumstances have been far from stable and uniform, and as the second, the conditions of soil and climate, vary widely over France, we must look deeper—to the more subtle influence of race. We must analyze the nation into its ethnic elements; determine the proportions in which these occur, and assign to each element its proper value.

In such an attempt we are at once confronted with the theories of two opposite schools of ethnology. The one school tells us that races are so mingled that primitive types are no longer represented on the earth; the other that a complex type which has resulted amongst a people from the crossing of races must, by a law of nature, not so much resolve itself into its constituent elements, as lose those which are least important or most

adventitious, and so recur to the element which is most primitive. And these theories we find represented in the instance before us by two eminent historians of the French—Sismondi contending that foreign intermixture has so prevailed in past ages amongst the inhabitants of France, as to render it impossible to distinguish one ethnic element from another; while M. Amédée Thierry claims for nineteen-twentieths of the present population of the country a descent from what he deems the primitive element, the Celtic, but in its double form, Gaelic and Kymric. In the mean between these two opposite schools of ethnology the truth, we believe, lies.

We propose, then, to consider the ethnology—we are not sure whether ethnogeny is not the fitter term—of the French people by the lights which history, on the one hand, and philology and anthropology on the other, afford. History, in her record of the distribution of races in ancient Gaul, and of the various modifications they have undergone, tells us what we are to expect as to the ethnic composition of the population of France: philology gives us some information, but her sphere is a limited one, owing to the remarkable phenomenon we have presented to us of a people unlearning their language without losing, to anything like an equal degree, their race, and so far justifying the plea anthropologists raise in behalf of their study—viz., that a people may more easily lose their language than their physical type: and lastly, anthropology concerning herself with details of anatomy and physiology—stature, colour of the eyes, hair, and skin, the proportions of the face, and pre-eminently of the brain, susceptibility to certain diseases—examines minutely and systematically the ethnological character of the existing population. In the matter of philology, we must acknowledge our obligation to M. Littré's "*Histoire de la langue Française*," a work which discusses with remarkable clearness and freedom from national prejudice the vexed question of the origin of the French tongue. The "*Mémoires*" and "*Bulletins de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris*" lie before us: they contain a vast body of facts in reference to our subject, and give evidence, especially in the maps and papers contributed by Drs. Broca, Boudin, and Lagneau, of careful and truly scientific observation. The exhaustive treatise of M. de Belloguet is, to say nothing of its intrinsic merits, a proof that the whole ethnological world of France has not been carried away by the ingenuity and talent which M. Amédée Thierry has displayed in his "*Histoire des Gaulois*."

One word as to the means anthropologists possess in France for carrying on their observations, and as to the method they adopt in one particular subject of investigation. Stature, as we have seen, is a note in ethnology, and an important one; but it

becomes an impossibility to ascertain the average stature of a population and to compare it with that of another, unless the subjects for measurement can be selected impartially and indiscriminately. Dr. Beddoe, who has taken no slight pains to ascertain the comparative stature of our own population, holds that of the four classes of the community he examined—private, lunatic, criminal, and military—the last is the least representative, from the fact that exceptional circumstances frequently lead our youth to enter the army, whereas, in France, the conscription furnishes us with fairly typical specimens of at least the lower classes of the population: the classes which, in the country districts, where there has been little change of residence, form the most favourable subject for ethnological study. The multiplicity of exemptions from military service granted on account of deficiency of stature in any particular district is, of course, in inverse proportion to the average height of the population of that district. MM. Broca and Boudin have given us the results of their studies of the recruiting lists, which are published yearly, in the form of maps on which the departments of France appear light or shaded according to the paucity or multiplicity of exemptions. Facts of this sort form a sound basis for induction. But however ascertainable the comparative stature of a population may be through the means of the conscription, its craniology, about which “savans” would still rather know, is not so easily to be learnt. No “décret,” royal, republican, or imperial, has ever fixed for the French conscript a standard of cranial capacity, or, what is of more importance to the anthropologist, of cranial proportion, so that in this respect scientific inquiry when directed to the living subject must depend upon accuracy of observation, or the willingness of the individual to be measured. As Dr. Beddoe, if we remember rightly, testifies to the readiness which a Danish crew in the port of Bristol manifested in submitting their heads in a body to the measuring tape, we must hope that an equally accommodating turn is to be met with amongst our neighbours, who have the reputation of not lacking courtesy. Craniometry, to judge from the engravings before us of the elaborate contrivances employed for this purpose, has been brought in France to a high pitch of perfection; but as individuals, like races, differ from one another as to the thickness of their skulls, anthropology puts slight store by the living subject when desirous of accurately ascertaining cranial capacity. And there need be no lack of subjects for such exact and accurate study. Cemeteries, ossuaries, tumuli, dolmens, the common sepulchres of the lowly in recent times, the tombs of the mighty in the far past of our world’s existence, with inscription or without, all alike furnish a field of study which is the anthropologist’s

own, where he may examine and test at his will the brain capacity of our remote ancestors, and speculate as to the races to which they belonged. With regard to the method adopted in the measurement of skulls, the following is that which M. Broca advocates, and himself adopts. The skull is reversed and the orbits filled with cotton. Fine shot is then poured in through the "foramen magnum" till apparently the skull is filled. Through the insertion of an instrument in the form of a cone the shot is forced into the small cavities, which without such pressure it would not reach. When the vacuum thus formed has been refilled, the skull is emptied and the shot poured into a graduated tube, its amount indicating the capacity of the skull. In this way twenty skulls may be measured and tabulated by an expert hand in the course of an hour. Of the positive information to be gained by accurate measurements of this sort, there can be little doubt—unless, indeed, craniology be utterly at fault—with the results before us of M. Broca's examination of more than 350 specimens, representing, as the cemeteries from which they were taken prove, different periods and different classes of French history and society.

To the inquirer into the question of race in France, language, we have said, offers no very fruitful field for research. The use of a Latin-derived tongue varied by many, but still homogeneous dialects and patois is spread like an alluvium over the whole country with the exception of Lower Brittany and the Basque provinces, in which districts the Celtic tongue in its Kymric form, and the "Escuara" or "Euscara" respectively crop up, formations of earlier origin—the latter, indeed, a language of great antiquity, and owning no affinity with any Indo-European tongue. As we shall have occasion to refer hereafter to these two exceptional languages, when dealing with the evidence of history as to the Bretons and the Basques, we shall confine ourselves at present to the subject of the national speech of France. The comparatively speedy and almost universal adoption throughout Gaul of the particular *lingua rustica* of Rome, out of which modern French was subsequently developed, is by no means unimportant, as indicating how thoroughly Roman influences penetrated Gallic society, and how widely the network of Roman organization was spread over the land, but it detracts from the evidence which a less general diffusion of the tongue would have supplied as to the race of those who spoke it. On this point, proving too much, it proves very little; for none will contend that the Gallic populations became as Roman in blood as in speech. It is with regard to the introduction, and the amount introduced, into Gaul, not of a Roman, but a Teutonic element that the French language has been taken as a touchstone.

What share has the Teuton had in moulding the speech of the country of which he became possessed, and what signs has he thus shown of his presence? To answer this question we must touch in a very few words upon the origin of the French tongue.

Max Müller's theory, as put forth in his "*Nuances Germaniques jetées sur les mots Romains*," is, that the Romance languages, modern French consequently amongst them, were not such as would have been developed amongst the Romans of Italy or of the provinces, but were such as the barbarians, and especially the Germans, were likely to have evolved in learning and appropriating Latin. In other words, they were the result of Latin being spoken by German mouths, or, to vary slightly the proverb as to the perfection of modern Italian, they were "*lingua Latina in bocca Tedesca*." On this point he is directly opposed by M. Fuchs, who contends that their languages were evolved from the Latin without being affected by any German influence whatever. Between these two disputants M. Littré takes up a middle position. He lays down this general principle—that we must look for the parentage of the Romance languages of France, *i.e.*, the Provençal and modern French, not to the Latin of literature, but to its popular form, and that form, too, which was in use not in the time of Augustus, but four or five centuries after, at the period of the disorganization of the Empire, at a time when the language had already suffered considerable corruption on the lips of those who did not know it grammatically—when genders were already being confused, and inflections dropped. Gregory of Tours, the last author in Gaul who could pretend to any Latinity before Latin became a dead tongue, complains that his grammar was ever suffering from the solecisms which met his ears, and of which, doubtless, he was himself guilty in speaking. Yet, this process of gradual and progressive corruption was not brought about through barbarian invasion, but came from within. Accompanying it was another process, that of evolution: a process the result of which is shown in the fact that the Romance languages possess an undoubted advantage over the mother tongue, from which they have otherwise signally deteriorated, in the use of a pronominal article, definite and indefinite, and of a perfect definite tense and a conditional mood in the verb. Possibly, as M. Littré observes, the canon of purism was neglected in Rome itself after the downfall of the Empire, and its neglect may have produced in this instance a beneficial result: or possibly, as we venture to think, Greek influences may have led to these innovations: the influence in Gaul of Marseilles and her sister-colonies, and of Greek studies carried on in the schools which



sprung up under the Roman dominion. But in this process again we find no trace of the Teuton. Where he has left his mark is in the occurrence of the aspirate before certain words in French whose Latin originals are without it, and in the fact that where synonyms were in vogue in Latin, the use of the one word and the disuse of the other seems to have been determined by the existence of a cognate word in German. As instances of words thus becoming aspirated we may quote "haut"; "altus," and "hurler"; "ululare," where the German "hoch" and "heulen" suggest the reason of the change; while of the use of the one, and the disuse of the other of two synonyms we may mention "focus" (whence "feu") adopted rather than "ignis"; "laxare" (whence "laisser") rather than "sinere"; "laxus" (whence "lâche") rather than "segnis," owing to the attraction exercised by the cognate forms in German, "feuer" and "funkeln," "lassen" and "laz." In the terms of warfare and civil administration which the Teuton introduced into the popular Latin of Gaul, and which amount to over nine hundred words in number, we have further witness to his presence, as well as to the nature of the mutual relation of the two races, the Gallo-Roman and the Frank, just as in our own language the Welsh origin of many words that refer to the household life is an index of the subjection of the Celt to the Englishman. Yet with this vast importation of words into the vocabulary, the syntax of the French tongue bears no trace whatever of the Teuton. The popular Latin, the spoken tongue of Gaul, was adopted by her German conquerors. They moulded it, in a measure: they varied and enriched its vocabulary, but they learnt it all the same, and unlearned their own speech. That they did so argues, as it seems to us, that they were not numerically predominant over their Gallo-Roman subjects even in the north of Gaul; otherwise it is strange they should not have retained their own speech; for, inferior as their civilization may have been to that of the native population, it was not so inferior as to account for this phenomenon.

To turn to the evidence of history. The ethnological school whose tenet is that no primitive types are any longer represented on the face of the earth, may be ready to point, with regard to France, to the history of that country since the Roman conquest for a justification of their opinions. In the wars which preceded and accompanied the conquest it is computed that one-fourth of the native population perished. Barbarian tribes in their turn, like birds of prey, at once presage and attend upon the decline of the Roman power in Gaul. In the fifth century of our era two distinct colonizations, each followed by a century of more or less independent rule are

effected by German tribes : one by the Visigoths, the other by the Burgundians—a people partly of Vandal, partly of Scandinavian extraction. The Franks, likewise of German origin, bring a large portion, and in time nearly the whole of the country, beneath their sway, proving their power in the legacy of their name. Hordes of Saracens overrun the southern provinces, and hold during forty years their footing in Languedoc ; and lastly in this list of invasions the tall ships of the Normans, the terror for more than an hundred years of every river of France that flowed into the English Channel, or the Atlantic, land, in the tenth century, their pirate masters on the shores of Neustria. Add to this catalogue of foreigners the constant importation under the Romans, and probably the Merovings as well, of a motley element in the persons of domestic and agricultural slaves, and we have indeed a numerous and varied array of tribes who have intermingled with one another on French soil for centuries past. Sismondi's protest against pride of pedigree in France seems no unjustifiable one. "*Tous les éléments ont été mêlés par le temps, et dans toutes les classes de la société il y a sans doute des Français qui descendent du Romain comme du Celte, du Germain comme du Scythe, de l'esclave comme de l'homme libre.*"

Yet notwithstanding this evidence of foreign and heterogeneous intermixture, we are so far one with the school of ethnology whose doctrine is persistence of the primitive type, as to deem it of all importance to examine carefully what we may term the earlier strata of the population of Gaul. On this subject M. Amédée Thierry is too well known as the historian par excellence of the Gauls not to claim our attention. Moreover, the ingenious system of Gallic ethnology which he has created, inconsistent though it is with the plain unadorned statements of Cæsar, has been till of late, and in many quarters is still, so widely and readily accepted as the clue to the interpretation of the facts which anthropological investigation presents to us, that its truth or falsity becomes a matter of no slight importance to the elucidation of our subject. We give, then, while we do not hesitate to criticize, M. Thierry's classification of the races of ancient Gaul. They are these :—1. The Iberian in its two branches, Aquitanian, and Ligurian. 2. The Gaelic or Celtic. 3. The Kymric, or Kymro-Belgic. 4. The Greek.

The Iberian parentage of the Aquitani seems to be pretty clearly made out by a consensus of authors, Pagan and Christian, as to the resemblance between the two peoples in point of physical configuration, speech, dress, and customs, as well as by the testimony of language itself. Restricted to the three most western valleys of the Pyrenees although the use of the

"Escuara" now is in France, yet the language is written on the face of the country in the names of hill, dale, and river—from the Pyrenees to the Garonne, and over a large portion of the Peninsula, the acknowledged home of the Iberian race. Whether its use had once prevailed to the north of the Garonne, and whether the tribes who there spoke it, had been driven down into the south-western corner of Gaul in which we find them when the light of history is first thrown across these obscure regions, is a question as to which we may speculate, but which we cannot decide in the affirmative from local nomenclature. Of the Ligurian branch of the Iberian stock—if indeed it belonged to this stock at all—we know in one way still less: no dialect or patois of Ligurian origin surviving even in the most retired mountain valley to link the present with the past. Yet their name, if Thierry's derivation of it from a Basque word, "lig-or"—living on high, be a true one, so far argues the Iberian parentage he assigns them. The district these tribes occupied in Gaul—we can scarcely say possessed, for other tribes shared it with them—stretched from the sources of the Garonne to the Var; but their standing-ground in Gaul was narrowed by reverses and defeat. Hardy and industrious as the Ligurian race is represented to have been, it was not one born to govern or to display the higher and the nobler virtues of humanity. Their maritime tribes were much addicted to piracy, while those of the inland and mountainous districts followed the chase or worked for Celtic employers. In no portion of Gaul may we more naturally look than in this its south-eastern region not only for the influence of Roman civilization, but the infusion of Roman blood, and when we add, as we must, a Greek element, the Gothic and Saracenic admixture of later days, and the motley tribe of merchants and civil employés that ever thronged the entrance to the highway of the Rhone, when once Gaul had been merged into the vast empire which made all the Roman world kin, we can scarcely expect to find on ground trodden by the feet of so many nations the vestiges of the Ligurian race as clear and distinct as we may those of the Iberian or Aquitanian amongst the retired valleys that nestle on the northern slope of the western Pyrenees.

The people next in order on Thierry's list is the one whose Latin name of "Galli" we find applied as a general political term to the whole body of the Gallic tribes, but which specially belonged to those who occupied the large central region of Gaul. With this people we are introduced to the peculiarities of M. Thierry's system, and we shall do well at once to point them out. Known to every schoolboy is Cæsar's classification of the tribes of Gaul. With the first of his classes of tribes we have

already done ; the other two, the Galli, or, as they called themselves, the Celtæ, and the Belgæ remain. To the first of these two latter Cæsar assigns the region between the Garonne and the Seine and the Marne ; to the second, that between the two last-named rivers and the Rhine. Thierry alters or modifies the nomenclature, and redistributes the territories of these two sets of tribes. The term "Celtæ," which we have the high authority of Cæsar for considering as that by which the central tribes called themselves, Thierry discards, as not being generic, but simply local and accidental—signifying dwellers in the forest (*Celtach*)—whereas the term "Galli," for what reasons we shall presently see, was generic. That of Belgæ he likewise discards, as applicable to a few tribes alone. Taking Cæsar's statement as to the difference in point of language, customs, and political institutions, between the Galli and Belgæ in as harsh a sense as that in which it is viewed by the supporters of the German origin of the northernmost of these two peoples, and not modifying it by Strabo's testimony to the effect that it was between the Aquitani and the "rest of the Galli" that the true racial distinction lay, M. Thierry, in the face of opposing evidence, deems the difference between these two upper sections of Gaul in point of language clearly made out, and on the strength of this conclusion he bases his nomenclature. As the South of Britain was occupied by tribes of Gallic, and by some of Belgic origin, he looks to its extreme regions of Wales and Cornwall for the language of ancient Belgium, and finds it in the still-spoken "kymraig" of the Welsh, and its kindred, though dissevered dialect, the Cornish. On this ground he applies the term "Kymry" to the tribes of Northern Gaul. By parity of reasoning, as well as from the resemblance of their name, he concludes that the Galli, who were of kindred origin, and whose name he interprets as the Latin rendering of "Gael" or "Gaidheal," must have spoken "Gaelic ;" the language which constitutes the other branch of the Celtic speech, and which is represented at the present day in the Gaelic of Scotland, the Manx, and the Erse. Thus he lays aside Cæsar's nomenclature, and adopts one based on linguistic grounds. In no closer conformity with the text of Cæsar is our historian's geographical distribution of these two sets of tribes. The Gaels, the first arrived by many centuries, and the undisputed masters of the soil, except in the Iberian and Ligurian districts, are in the sixth or seventh century B.C. driven from their possessions, first in the north and subsequently in the west of Gaul by tribes of kindred extraction, whom, equally with their Belgic successors, M. Thierry terms Kymry. The centre more or less, and the whole of the eastern and south-eastern districts were thus all that remained to the Gael. The

Vosges, the highlands of Burgundy, the western boundary of Auvergne, and the Cevennes formed the barrier beyond which he stood his ground. If he remained in the west at all, it was only on sufferance and in subjection to his Kymric kinsman and lord. The statements in the "Commentaries," which appear to contradict this arrangement, are met by the supposition that over the wide region between the Seine and the Garonne, Gaelic and Kymric tribes had become in language, customs, and political interests, so far one body as to justify their classification under the one common name which Cæsar gives them, and to render them politically distinct from the Kymric tribes to the north of the Seine.

But we have by no means exhausted the stores of M. Thierry's ingenuity. His "Kymry" are none other than the Cimbri of Jutland, the terrible opponents of Rome, and the Cimmerici of the Euxine. Whether one or the other, or both of these ethnological couplings, which our historian has attached so deftly on the combined strength of a passage or two of Strabo, and Diodorus Siculus and a Welsh triad will hold, is not to our present purpose. It may, indeed, occur to us as strange that so great a people as the Cimbri—for Tacitus attests their former importance—should, in this their earliest invasion of Gaul, have left behind them, in Jutland, a name which, according to Thierry, they brought with them from the Euxine; strange, too, that when the Cimbri of historical flesh and blood—no shadowy Kymry arising out of truly Cimmerician darkness—did appear in Cæsar's time on the plains of Belgium, they did not find more than one tribe to recognise their connexion, and this tribe the acknowledged descendants of a body of warriors left behind in these parts on the occasion of the great Cimbrian invasion of the south of Gaul.

We have dwelt thus at length upon M. Thierry's novel nomenclature and distribution of the tribes of ancient Gaul, and for reasons we have already given. The fact is, these Kymry and Gaels meet us everywhere, in every "Mémoire" and "Bulletin" of the French Anthropological Society that treats of the ethnology of France. M. Broca himself, than whom no "savan" of that society claims from us higher respect, frees himself, as it seems to us, only gradually, and that not without M. de Belloquet's help, from the spell under which M. Thierry had laid him and his compeers. For the ethnological paradox involved in this Kimro-Gaelic division is none other than this—that the Celtic stock was distributed in Gaul in two branches, differing, as indeed was possible, in language, and wholly unlike one another, as we shall see, as to physical appearance in everything that is allowed to constitute distinction of type.

Now this system of M. Thierry's strikes us as faulty in more than one respect. To begin with: in the very matter on which he bases his famous classification of Kymry and Gaels—viz., distinction of language. The readiness with which the two confederations of tribes, the northern and the central, could enter into concerted action, and the fact of their common attendance at the same deliberative assembly militate against the notion that such a difference existed between the languages of the two sets of tribes as is now to be found between the Kymric and Gaelic dialects. The Welsh-speaking Welshman and the Erse-speaking Irishman of the present day, the linguistic representatives of these Kymry and Gaels, would, unquestionably, find considerable difficulty in understanding one another. Moreover, M. de Belloquet has shown as the result of a careful examination of 321 words—the sum total of those which have come down to us as Gallic—that about two-thirds of these are equally referable to a Kymric and a Gaelic source; a fact which inclines us to doubt whether more than one language—whatever its varieties of dialect—was spoken in Gaul of Celtic origin, that is to say—for the Iberian in the south spoke a tongue of his own.

But if no ground can be found for this bifurcation of the Celtic stock in Gaul in difference of language, can one be discovered in difference of physical type? Did the Gallic—or to speak ethnologically, Celtic—race present any difference of this kind? This, indeed, is a question with which an historian as such was not bound to concern himself; yet, as a matter of fact, the author of the "*Histoire des Gaulois*" states in his preface that he considers his position materially strengthened by the result of anthropological investigation carried on by the late eminent physiologist, M. W. Edwards, amongst the populations of France. Whether it is so or no remains to be seen; at any rate the argument from the anthropology of the ancient Gauls cannot be deemed foreign to our examination of M. Thierry's system. Thanks to the pen of the classical historians and poets, and the chisel of the sculptors of antiquity, we possess a few Gallic portraits, which taken together afford us some idea of the physical characteristics of this people. The points about the physiognomy and configuration of the Gauls, which seem to have made the deepest impression upon the Romans, are stature and colour of hair. Cæsar says that the Gauls were at first inclined to despise the Roman soldiers for their shortness of stature. Still they were, in this respect, themselves inferior to the Germans. Suetonius tells us of a mad freak Caligula indulged in when desirous of swelling the number of his German captives. He selected the tallest of the Gauls about him, and bade them redden their hair and let it grow in German fashion. To judge from a passage in Tertullian, the difference between the

two nations in colour of hair was not great; it was probably not more than that which is denoted by the difference between the two words "flavus" and "rutilus," for the Father rebukes the matrons of Rome for dyeing their hair with the golden red of the saffron to make it resemble the chevelures of Gallic and German beauties. Curiously enough we have no mention of any colour as characteristic of the Gallic eye till we come to Ammianus Marcellinus, who gives it as a bluish-grey (*χαροπός*). For contour of face and shape of head we must turn to the bas-reliefs and medals. Unfortunately, none of the former bear inscriptions, and we are left to draw the inference that they are Gallic from the localities in which they are found. Such as they are, together with a far more numerous collection of coins and medals, they present the type of a long-shaped head and face with a slightly-curved nose. The medal, which has been termed the "Æs grave" of Rimini from its size and the locality in which it was brought to light, is perhaps of more value than any other for its expression of this type. But as the tribe of the Senones who had colonized this part of Cisalpine Gaul, and some member of which was with little doubt the subject of the medal, occupied in Gaul proper a borderland between M. Thierry's Kymry and Gaels, the tribe together with its Cisalpine representative has been claimed for both of these two peoples. A few medals have been found in the southern and central districts to represent another type—that of a head and face of a rounder form—but they are altogether in a minority. The noticeable point about them is that the type of features they represent bears a close resemblance to that which occurs on the coins found in Iberian Gaul. The general conclusion we come to is that only one type—viz., a tall blonde one, was known to the Roman historians and poets as Gallic, but that another type did exist, as is shown by the medals. But according to M. Thierry's division of the Gauls into two races, the latter should have been as well known as the former.

Still, whatever the physical features of the ancient Gauls were, Thierry, as we have said, considers his position strengthened by the results of M. Edwards's anthropological studies of the present population of France. These, as far as they were carried on, for death unfortunately cut short the work of that eminent labourer in the field of science, were to the effect that a duality of type was clearly discoverable amongst the French of the present day; occurring, too, as M. Edwards somewhat hastily concluded, in such a manner as to correspond with Thierry's distribution of Kymry and Gaels. His anthropological observations thus seeming to tally with his friend's historical speculations, it was an easy and a natural step for M. Edwards to adopt as a nomenclature for his two types that which the historian had applied in his

novel and ingenious scheme of Gallic history to the tribes of the north and centre of Gaul respectively : the Belgæ and Celtæ of our unsophisticated boyhood. Thus, the one type was termed "Kymric," and the other "Gaelic;" and thus the new Gallic ethnography received an apparent degree of support, but which was wholly a fictitious one, from scientific observation. M. Edwards's types are drawn in his "Caractères physiologiques des races humaines," with too accurate a pencil for us not to give them.

"*Type Kymrique.*—Tête longue, front large et élevé, le nez recourbé, la pointe en bas et les ailes du nez relevées, le menton fortement prononcé et saillant, la stature haute.

"*Type Gall.*—Tête arrondie de manière à se rapprocher de la forme sphérique, front moyen, un peu bombe et fuyant vers les tempes, yeux grands et ouverts; le nez à partir de la depression à sa naissance est à peu pres droit, c'est à dire qu'il n'a aucune courbure prononcée; l'extrémité en est arrondie ainsi que le menton; la taille est moyenne."

Minute as these descriptions are, and we could scarcely wish them more so if needed for detective purposes, they fail, like photographs, to represent the colour of the eyes and hair. We shall rectify these omissions on the part of M. Edwards from other sources, and write under the Kymric portrait, blue or bluish-grey eyes and fair hair and complexion; and under the Gaelic, brown eyes and brown or dark hair and complexion. Here, then, unquestionably, two opposite types are presented to us; and so far from questioning, we point out their existence in the population of France. But we must express our surprise that so intelligent and clear-sighted a physiologist as M. Edwards undoubtedly was, should have supposed that a duality of type in the population necessarily bore out Thierry's duality of the Celtic stock; or that types so opposite as those he had portrayed could both have been Celtic.

What, we may now ask, is the actual distribution of the physical type in France at the present day? Absolute purity of type of any sort we cannot, indeed, expect to find. Subject as France has been in so great a degree not only to foreign intermixture, but to the crossing of her early races, an approximation to such purity is all we can look for, and this only in exceptional instances. But it is no easy matter to ascertain what the physical characteristics of a population are; for the information furnished by the note-books of anthropological observers must be more or less partial. There is, in fact, only one of the characteristics we care to learn, about which we can inform ourselves with any degree of certainty, and that is stature. The "Comptes rendus du recrutement de l'armée" help us to this: as to other points which they fail to register, we must glean that information from other, though less dependable sources. We have already



alluded to the maps which MM. Broca and Boudin have formed upon these lists, and shall proceed to notice a few of their most salient features. M. Broca examines the military returns over a period of nineteen years, from 1831 to 1849 inclusive, and arranges the departments of France according to the amount of exemptions from service on account of deficiency of stature which had been granted in each department during this period.\* The sequence thus brought out proves to be by no means irrespective of geographical position: the exemptions occurring less frequently, in other words, the stature of the population, being highest in the departments of the north and north-east, lowest in those, to speak generally, of the south and west of France. So much so, that a line drawn, as M. Broca draws it, obliquely across the country, from the bay of Mt. St. Michel to Grenoble, so as to divide France into two unequal portions, separates the region in which high stature prevails from that in which low stature is the rule. M. Broca then traces another line, parallel for the most part to his first, from a point on the north-west coast, which is marked by the commencement of the boundary line between Picardy and Normandy, to the base of the Franche Comté. In this way three zones are formed. The south-western zone contains fifty-one departments (Corsica is excluded altogether) three-fifths of the geographical extent, and nineteen millions of the population of France; the north-eastern zone, twenty-one departments, nine millions of inhabitants, and about one quarter of the acreage of the country; while the intermediate belt contains thirteen departments, six millions of inhabitants, and about one-sixth of the acreage—the average stature of its population being higher than that of the south-western zone, lower than that of the north-eastern. M. Boudin's corresponding map, which refers to a subsequent period—viz., from 1850 to 1859, gives much the same results; while a second map of his, formed upon the returns for the Cuirassier service, in which a higher degree of stature is required, coincides generally with his first, and with M. Broca's, while it offers some curious points of difference. How widely one department may differ from another in the stature of its population we see by looking at the two departments which occupy respectively the highest and the lowest places in the scale—viz., Doubs and Corrèze. In the former, the exceptions granted for deficiency of stature

---

\* In the second, and we believe the latest, number of a third and yet incomplete volume of the "*Mémoires de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris*," which has come into our hands since writing the above, M. Broca has published another map referring to a period of thirty years, from 1831 to 1860. The order of the departments is slightly varied on this map from that given in the first, but the difference is not such as to affect in the least our general argument.

amount to 23 : in the latter, to 189 per 1000 ; while as to the difference between the three zones, we find the average of exemptions to amount in the north-eastern zone to 42·8, in the south-western to 89·3, in the intermediate one to 56·8 per 1000 ; the south-western division thus furnishing twice as many exemptions as the north-eastern.

Before going farther into statistics, we may ask, How are these wide differences to be accounted for, and what do they imply ? It may be urged that they are the result of what French ethnologists term "*les milieux* ;" and if such they are, they are valueless, of course, as indications of distinction of race. But although soil, climate, and above all quality of food, are conditions calculated to affect the stature of a population, it will be evident, after a very slight inspection of the statistics our maps furnish, that the differences we have glanced at cannot wholly, if at all, arise from causes of this kind. To take first the matter of soil. In Touraine, the garden of France, the exemptions—we are dealing only with those which are granted on account of deficient stature—amount to 117 ; in the fertile district of Limagne d'Auvergne, to 149 per 1000 ; while as a rule they are numerous throughout the Aquitanian group of departments, which is by no means a barren region. In the next place, the influence of climate. As the lines of demarcation between these zones run, not horizontally but obliquely, and wholly irrespective of latitude, we have here plainly no adequate cause of these differences. Nor will the vicinity of mountains serve better as an explanation ; for the population in the neighbourhood of the Jura range is as remarkable for its height as that of the two Alpine departments for its shortness of stature. Quality of food, again, however undeniable its influence, will not account for the phenomena before us. The Normans, for instance, are notorious for good living. With them "*les domestiques sont nourris comme les maîtres*," as a peasant remarked, with all due appreciation of the fact, to the author of "*L'Economie rurale de la France* ;" yet the Norman departments, taken as a whole, rank only in the second division.

Conditions of this sort failing to explain this difference of stature, we are driven to seek an explanation in the influence of race. Can it be accounted for in this way ? That M. Broca for one deems that it can be, and is to be, so explained is evident from the fact that he terms his north-eastern zone "*Kymric*," his south-western "*Celtic*," and the intermediate one "*Kymro-Celtic*." His nomenclature, we may observe, partially recalls Thierry's, but only partially ; for although its author accepts the term "*Kymric*," he will have nothing to do with the term "*Gaelic*," utterly discrediting as he does the notion that one section of the Gauls spoke Kymric and the other Gaelic, while

he makes use of the term "Celtic" instead, not indeed in an ethnological sense, but that in which Cæsar uses it, a political one. However, the nomenclature of these zones is of little moment; the evidence upon which this tripartite division of the population of France is based is all that need concern us. The broad fact we have to go upon is the difference of stature between the populations, not so much of one department and another, but of the two north-eastern zones taken together, and of the south-western zone; for it is between these two main divisions that the line of demarcation, more or less along its whole length, but especially where it coincides with the course of the Loire, is drawn so clearly and sharply. To difference in point of stature we may add difference in point of complexion and cranial conformation; but as this addition is made upon the strength of observation alone, we cannot vouch for the degree of precision with which lines of demarcation can be drawn in these latter respects.

In any attempt to explain these differences on the ground of distinction of race, the foreign intermixture to which the native population was a long while subjected after the Roman had set foot in Gaul must be taken into account, and its influence eliminated, before that of pre-existing causes is regarded. With regard to the Romans, we have no means of testing the influence they exercised upon the *physique* of the Gallic races through intermixture. Their distribution as civil and military servants over the country being so general, we can only infer, from the acknowledged fact of their comparatively low stature, that the effect of such intermixture would be to generally depress the high stature of the Gauls. In the south-east of France, where as colonists they were probably more numerous than elsewhere, traces of a Roman type of countenance are still discoverable in the population, but over too narrow a section of the community to afford ground for induction. On reference to our maps we find two remarkable exceptions to the general prevalence of the low stature in the south-western division. In M. Broca's map Hérault (Bas Languedoc) is shaded so as to indicate a comparative paucity of exemptions—in other words, a degree of fairly high stature—while in M. Boudin's Cuirassier-service map, whose chief value is that it brings out exceptional elements in a population, this department stands before many that belong to the middle zone; the inference from which two facts, taken together, is that two races in this region exist side by side; and M. Lagneau informs us that in the mountainous district of the Tarn, the adjoining department to Hérault, and in the neighbourhood of Toulouse and Narbonne, a section of the population is found to differ from the wide mass in point of height and strength, length

of head and face, and the red and fair colour of their hair. Now it is in Languedoc—or Gothie, as it was formerly called—that we are warranted by history in looking for the footsteps of the Visigoth; for it was into this narrow region that he was driven after the fatal battle of Vouillé; and we should unhesitatingly assign to the influence of a Teutonic ancestry this divergence from the prevailing type, were there no others to put in a claim to the ancestral honours in the persons of the Volcæ, two confederations of tribes, formerly of great power and importance, whose name certainly resembles that of the Belgæ, and, if we are to trust the readings of certain MSS., was identical with it. Our second exception occurs in the departments of Les Deux Sèvres and Charente Inférieure, the first of which ranks as 20th, the second as 34th in the list of departments. By comparing as before the maps of the two Services, we find not so much the presence of a high-statured population by the side of a low-statured one, as a general prevalence of high stature. The fact that the Alani, notably a tall race, planted colonies in this region—where, indeed, they have left their mark in the name of “Pays d’Aulnis”—suggests a not unlikely cause for this difference in the population. More or less the population of the western seaboard of France, ranked though this region is within the zone of lowest stature, exhibits a fair degree of height; and one altogether above that which is common in the inland and central districts, whose remarkably low degree of stature it is, as will be shown, that depresses the general average of the south-western division. It seems natural to suspect that the stature of this maritime population has been heightened owing to the presence of a seaborne Scandinavian or Teutonic element.

If we pass from the south-western half of France to the north-eastern we find the department of the Doubs marked on M. Broca’s map as first, and the Jura and Côte d’Or as second and third respectively, for paucity of exemptions; while in the Cuirassier-service map we find the Doubs preserving its pre-eminence, and the Jura ranking as fourth. Now the Sequanie or Franche-Comté of later days, the larger part of which province was composed of these two departments, the Doubs and the Jura, fell within the limits of both the first and the second Burgundian kingdoms. From the pen of one who was contemporary with the second appearance of the Burgundians in Gaul, namely, Sidonius Apollinaris, the witty poet-bishop of Clermont, we possess some information as to the physical and mental characteristics of this people. In a graphic description of the audience chamber of the Visigothic Euric at Bordeaux, our author introduces the Burgundian as towering “seven feet” high, above a crowd of co-suplicants, Saxons, Herulians, Ostrogoths, Franks, and

Romans. But in intellectual capacity he rates him in more than one passage at a low level, and with such an estimate we must own that the analytical turn of the Franche-Comtois mind, as indicated by the eminence these provincials have attained to in jurisprudence, criticism, and mathematics is little in accordance. But possibly the lively, versifying, tennis-playing bishop would have deemed pursuits so grave as these as still indicative of a dull brain and a stolid disposition. In the north-east of France generally our maps represent a prevalence of high stature, to which anthropological observation here as elsewhere adds length of head and a tendency to a blonde tint in the complexion. With our classical authorities before us to attest the great height and the fairness of skin of the ancient Germans, we cannot but attribute in large measure the fact of a physique of this character to the presence of the Franks. Their political predominance, their known prolificness, and the accession of numerical strength they received under Charlemagne alike justify us in this.

Normandy presents an average of fairly high stature; the Cotentin, a very Norman district, something more than this, at least in a section of its population, for here again a curious lack of accordance between the two maps suggests the presence of two races—one mixed and the other purer. La Manche, which is coterminous with the Cotentin, has by no means a small number of exceptions to show from the Line service, for it ranks as low as 38th in the scale, but it furnishes, from some quarter or other, a very fair contingent to the Cuirassiers, in the map of which service it ranks as high as 13th. Nor is this the only sign of the Scandinavian element, whose presence here we naturally suspect. The length of visage, pale blonde colour of the hair, and the blue or grey eyes which here and there characterize the population, attest it no less. So too, the general vigour of the Norman population. Arthur Young was so impressed with the good looks of these provincials as to ask whether it had occurred to our aristocracy to attribute the beauty and refinement of their wives and daughters to the fact of their Norman descent. With all allowance, too, for the influence of "*les milieux*," we believe that the energy and spirit of enterprise which characterized the old Northmen is still to be traced in the prosperity, absence of indigence, and unusual longevity for which the natives of this province are conspicuous. It is remarkable that while in France generally the average length of life, taken over a period of ten years, was found to be 34 years, and in Britany 30, it amounted in Normandy to 50 years.

What inference is to be drawn from this prevalence of high stature in the north and north-east, and still more from the ex-

ceptions to the rule of low stature in the south and west of France? As it seems to us, this. The introduction of a Teutonic and northern element had a tendency to heighten, or, at least, to keep up the naturally high stature of the population, to reinforce the native element, which as we have seen was of similar type, and this in proportion to the amount introduced. In the north the Teutonic influx was at once large and continuous, and as a natural consequence, it is in this region that it has produced the most decided and conspicuous results.

But another question awaits us. What has led to the absence or disappearance from the south-western division of France of the type of tall blonde men—the type which history attests as Gallic, and which we associate with that of the Celtic race? On the one hand there was not, as in the north, an ever-fresh supply of a Teutonic element to reinforce the type, as far as it did exist; and on the other hand there existed in the extreme south-west a type of a very opposite character, viz., the Iberian. Of the physical characteristics of the Iberians we know, for some reason or other, very little from the ancients. The concise testimony of Tacitus as to the “*Colorati vultus tortique plerumque crines*”—(olive hue and curly hair—a form of hair which goes more generally with dark than light-coloured hair) of this people is, perhaps, our chief source of information. We are told also of their agility, and should infer from this that they were of low rather than high stature. Whether ethnically distinct from it or no there was, at any rate, besides the Iberian race, the Ligurian in the south-east: a race of a short type of head, and of a small and well-built frame. To intermixture with these races—both low-statured, and one at least of dark complexion—the Gaul of the south was subject, and the natural tendency of such an intermixture would be towards lessening his stature, and darkening his complexion.

But this was by no means all. The existence not only in France but throughout a large portion of Europe of pre-Celtic populations is now a matter of general recognition. What their characteristic types were we can learn only through the researches of anthropology. Retzius, the great Swedish physiologist, was of opinion, and many ethnologists have since held, that these races were all of a brachycephalous, or short-headed type. That some were is evident, but that they were not all so, is no less clearly proved. As to priority of distribution, it would appear from Mr. Thurnam's interesting discoveries in our own island that the races of the dolichocephalous or long-headed type were the oldest. The substitution of bronze for stone implements is allowed to mark an epoch in pre-historic times, and Mr. Thurnam has shown that while no metal implements have been found

in the long barrows, in whose lowest and earliest deposits the long skulls occur, they are found in the round barrows, the use of which brachycephalous races—the vanguard, perhaps, of the long-headed Celts, appear to have introduced. If this was the case, it would follow that the population which immediately preceded the Celtic race in the occupation of the soil of Gaul, and with which this tall fair people were brought into direct contact was that of a brachycephalous type. That this was so we may point amongst other proofs to the results of M. Broca's examination of a large number of skulls which were taken indiscriminately from cemeteries of different dates in Paris. To take the most ancient of these cemeteries : a vault which from its having been built over so far back as the twelfth century, could not have been used at any subsequent period for purposes of interment :—out of 115 skulls removed from this vault 41 proved to be of a dolichocephalous type, 38 of a brachycephalous, and 36 of a medium type—the difference in point of number between the long and short skulls being thus a small one. Those of the first class, the dolichocephalous, Broca attributes to the Indo-Germanic races, whether Celtic or Teutonic : those of the second the brachycephalous, to the descendants of the indigenous races. If, then, we are to trust the evidence of craniology, and we are fully aware that too much may be made of this evidence, we must acknowledge the co-existence in almost equal proportions, of a brachycephalous type with a dolichocephalous one, in the population of a part of France where dolichocephaly, as represented by the Celtic and Teutonic elements, was likely to have prevailed. In the south-western half of France, permeated as it has been far less by Teutonic blood, we should naturally expect to find a still larger proportion of the brachycephalous type : a type, which we are warranted on anatomical grounds in connecting with shortness rather than height of stature. It is precisely in this division of the country that low stature prevails.

With a view to further testing the influence of this indigenous element upon the imported Celtic one, we shall take the three districts of the south-western zone in which low stature is most conspicuous. These are formed of groups of departments : an Alpine, comprising two departments, Les Hautes Alpes, and Les Basses Alpes ; a central group comprising twenty, and a Breton, four departments. Speaking roughly, the Rhone and the Loire bound the central group on the east and north-east ; the Garonne skirts it on the south-west, although at some little distance, while an imaginary line drawn from Tours through Poitiers and Angoulême forms a western boundary. The Breton comprises the departments of Finisterre, Côtes du Nord, Morbihan, and Ile-et-Vilaine. The remarkably low stature prevalent in these

districts is shown by the fact that their average of exemptions amounts to 109.9, while in the lower zone, to which these belong, taken generally it amounts only to 89.3. Granting that allowance should be made for the influence of such conditions as those of climate, soil, and quality of food, we may observe, however, that it is most unlikely that in these three groups, one of which is mountainous, one inland, and the other maritime, an uniform set of conditions producing similar results should exist. What does this unusual depression of stature indicate as to race? We find that three departments of the central group occupy respectively the three lowest places on the scale: Puy de Dôme (part of Auvergne) ranking as 84th, with 149 per 1000 as its average of exemptions; Haute Vienne and Correze (Limousin), as 85th and 86th, with 176 and 189 per 1000, as their respective averages to be placed against the 23 per 1000 of Doubs. In connexion with, if not in explanation of, these facts we quote the following words from M. Broca:—

“Les Limousins et les Auvergnâts de nos jours s'appellent Français sans être de race Franque; leurs ancêtres au temps de César s'appelaient Celtes sans être de race Celtique. Ils descendaient principalement d'une population antérieure à l'invasion des Celtes, et leurs caractères physiques étaient ceux de cette population, plus ou moins modifiés par un mélange incontestable avec leurs conquérants Celtiques.”

The influence of a free Celtic population which M. Broca here traces throughout a portion, has been, we suspect, at work more or less throughout the whole of the central group as well as the Alpine group, although from the position of the latter we must in its case allow for the probable presence of a Ligurian element. The Breton group is one of no slight interest, and it could hardly be otherwise from the geographical isolation of the province, its long-continued political separateness from France, and not least the survival of the Celtic tongue throughout its western division. We may safely assert that no region of France, excepting only the narrow district of the Basque provinces, is more free from foreign intermixture, whether Roman, Teutonic, or Scandinavian, than that which comprises the inland districts of Lower Britany, or La Vrai Bretagne Bretonnante. The anthropological features of the Breton group, which have been brought out prominently over a portion of its extent by M. Broca's subdivision of the departments into cantons, are mainly these: a tall blonde race peopling the seaboard, and a small dark or brown one inhabiting the central districts. To these populations the Thierry-Edwards school triumphantly point as pure specimens of Kymry and Gaels; occurring side by side in a province whose inhabitants, however widely differing



amongst themselves, must be Celtic because they speak Celtic—a line of argument which, although generally fair, would prove Frenchmen to be of Roman extraction because they speak a Latin-derived tongue. Unfortunately for this Kymro-Gaelic division, the inland or so-called Gaelic population speak a Kymric tongue as well as the seaboard population, the so-called Kymric one; and as this latter is allowed to have been formed, in the first instance, largely, if not wholly, of immigrants and refugees, it is most improbable that the possessors of the soil should have laid aside their own Gaelic speech to assume that of the new-comers. Yet that Gaels spoke Gaelic, and Kymry Kymric, is a cardinal point of Thierry's system. That the occupation of a considerable portion of the seaboard of Lower Britany by a tall fair race is to be accounted for, in some measure, by the arrival in the 5th century of our era of bodies of emigrants from Great Britain there is little doubt. In this maritime population we recognise the true Celtic type, which was known as Gaelic to the ancients—for we contend that there was but one Celtic type and that a tall fair one; in the other population—the short, dark one—the type, which characterizes the inhabitants of Central France, and which is not, properly speaking, Celtic at all. Besides this close resemblance in physical type we find another point of connexion between the inland population of Lower Britany and that of the central region of France. According to Broca there are certain bodily infirmities whose occurrence in a district is plainly referable to hygienic conditions or circumstances; others again which are not to be attributed to such causes, but to the influence of race. Amongst this latter class he names short or weak vision and the tendency of the teeth to decay.\* Now these infirmities, as the "*Comptes rendus du recrutement de l'armée*" show, occur with a remarkably similar degree of infrequency amongst the small, dark or brown population of Lower Britany, and that of Central France.

From the close resemblance which exists, in more ways than one, between these two districts, taken in connexion with M. Broca's statement as to the origin of the Limousins and Auvergnats, we infer that the population of the south-western zone of France, instead of representing a separate branch of the Celtic stock, is

---

\* It is noteworthy that the tendency of the teeth to decay seems to occur amongst a population in inverse proportion to a tendency to a shortness of stature. The departments of Puy de Dôme, Finisterre, and Correze, which rank for stature as 84th, 80th, and 86th respectively, stand for soundness of teeth as 1st, 3rd, and 6th, while the Doubs and Jura departments, which stand at the top of the scale for stature, rank in the "*Carte Dentaire*" as 44th and 39th.

in a large measure the result of long-continued intermixture between the short and brachycephalous indigenes and their Celtic invaders—the short and, as we suppose, brown type of the more numerous indigenes, aided in the south by an Iberian and Ligurian element prevailing in the course of more than three decades of centuries over the tall fair type of the Celts. And this we see is the conclusion at which M. Broca arrives, although his application of the term “Celtic” to the lower zone, justifiable as it is as an adoption of Cæsar’s political nomenclature, is ethnologically incorrect, and calculated to mislead. Nineteen centuries ago the amalgamation of these races was not so far advanced, nor the preponderance of the small brown type over the tall fair one so conspicuous in the southern and central districts of the country as now; and this, together perhaps with the fact that the Celts were the dominant race, may account for the testimony of antiquity being so strongly in favour, as we have seen, of the tall fair type as the characteristic type of Gaul generally, without distinction of north and south.

It may occur to our readers to inquire whether it is not possible to simplify upon the triple parentage—indigenous, Iberian, and Ligurian—to which we have assigned the low stature and the brown complexion of the population in the south-western division of France. Was there no connexion between the Iberians and the brachycephalous indigenes which would render it probable that the Iberians were the historical representatives of these pre-Celtic races? Failing the testimony of language to any wider distribution in Gaul of the Iberian race than that which history assigns to it, has craniology with her strange revelations of the dim past anything to say on the subject? This is a question that has occurred frequently to the anthropological mind in France, and one that has given rise of late years to much careful investigation, and no slight difference of opinion. To solve it, it was necessary to search amongst existing populations for a type which could assert or justify a claim to being Iberian before it could be compared with that of the pre-historic indigenes. The testimony of a still spoken language—the “*Euscara*,” points, as we have said, to the Basques as the lineal descendants, if not of the Iberian Aquitani, yet of tribes of the same race. Curiously enough no Basque skull was to be found till a few years ago in any museum of Europe, except that of Stockholm which possessed two specimens, since found to be not genuine. It was, moreover, no easy matter to form a collection of Basque skulls—with so much reverence did this primitive people regard the resting-places of their dead. One September night, however, nine years ago, M. Broca and Senor Velasco of Madrid, having formed an assignation, effected a raid upon the

cemetery of a village over the Spanish border, and in the province of Guipuscoa, from which they carried off fifty-nine skulls, a single specimen having been secured previously by S. Velasco. The locality was deemed favourable for the observation of purity of type, from the fact that commercial industry had not long been introduced into it. The examination and measurement of these skulls proved, what was not expected, that they belonged to a dolichocephalous type. The preconceived notions of the anthropological world being thus upset, further researches were set on foot, especially on the French side of the Pyrenees. Measurements on the living subject argued brachycephaly, as did also the examination of fifty-seven skulls from an ossuary at St. Jean-de-Luz, in the province of Labourd. Which of these two types was to be reckoned the true Basque type? As matters now stand honours are divided, and the existence of a duality of type is supposed to point to an intermixture of races in times anterior, in all probability, to the Celtic invasion. Can, however, the brachycephalous French Basques be identified in type with the brachycephalous indigenes of pre-historic Gaul? Anthropology, in the person of M. Broca, detects a difference between the two sets of skulls; the Basque skulls being brachycephalous in the anterior region, with a large development of the occiput—their general capacity is remarkable\*—whereas those of the indigenous races are brachycephalous in the posterior instead of the anterior region. So far, then, craniology, if she has not refined over much, does not countenance the notion of identity between the Iberian and the indigenous races.

As the discovery of brachycephalous skulls in the north of France warrants us in inferring, what it would, at any rate, be natural to suppose, that the indigenous races were distributed over this portion of Gaul as well as over the south, we may ask, Why have not these races produced here the effect they produced in the south, of lowering the stature of the Celtic tribes with whom they mingled? We have already given one reason for the characteristic physique of the northern populations, but

---

\* The examination and comparison of these and the Parisian skulls have brought out some curious results. They are chiefly these. 1st. That of skulls belonging to the same period, those of the higher and richer classes surpass in size those of the poorer and lower classes. 2nd. That the skull of the nineteenth century has increased in size over that of the twelfth. 3rd. That of the three sets of skulls—1. The Basque; 2. Those from the Parisian cemeteries; 3. Those from the fosse of the Morgue, where the better class of "noyés"—those at least who have not been claimed by their friends—are buried, these last, "whose great wits were more than nearly allied to madness," rank first, and the Basque next, before those of Parisian aristocrats or proletaires in point of size.

another remains. The tribes who formed the van and main body of the invading Celtic host, after mingling for centuries on the soil of Gaul with the indigenous races, lost some of the most distinctive features of their stock ; whereas, those who arrived later, and who settled, as they naturally would from the direction in which they came, in the northern districts of their predecessors' possessions, were more likely to preserve their type, from the reinforcements they received from time to time from their own or a kindred stock, and from the fact that the indigenous element in Gaul had itself by this time lost some of its characteristics through Celtic intermixture. To this no less, perhaps, than to the stream of Teutonic immigration, must we attribute the tendency of the population of the northern and north-eastern departments towards high stature and a fair complexion.

What is remarkable is, that the small brown type, which is not Celtic, seems gradually to have gained ground throughout France upon the opposite type, which is Celtic ; for the type we naturally associate with the French, and which they represent as characteristic of themselves, is not the tall blonde type, but the small and brown one. To quote M. de Belloguet—

“ *Pris en masse nous sommes un peuple brun ou chatain aux yeux variant du noir au brun clair, d'une taille plutôt audessous de la moyenne qu'au-dessus, peu chargé d'embonpoint, et d'un tempérament fort peu lymphatique. Nos membres sont minces, notre force musculaire médiocre, mais notre constitution est énergique ; elle supporte les travaux les plus rudes, et brave aussi bien les rigueurs de l'hiver et les ardeurs de l'été que les longues fatigues ou les privations. Nous avons conservé la furie de l'attaque, mais avec plus d'agilité dans nos mouvements et de solidité dans la lutte. Enfin nos têtes sont plus rondes qu'ovales et nos traits arrondis.* ”

These are not the lines of Celtic physiognomy and configuration, but rather of those which we have traced as characteristic of the partly Iberian, partly Ligurian, and still more indigenous population of the south. Nor are they, except in one respect, the traits of the Celtic character. Of the qualities here named, impetuosity is the only one which the French have inherited from their white-limbed lymphatic Celtic ancestors, whom they so little resemble in physical appearance. On the other hand, agility, tone of constitution, capacity for enduring extremes of heat and cold—qualities which M. de Belloguet claims in the passage we have quoted, as characteristic of his fellow-countrymen suggest to us, in our ignorance of all save the anatomical features of the indigenous populations, a descent from the active Iberian and the hardy Ligurian races, to whom in outward appearance the French of the present day bear, unquestionably, a close resemblance. The

Celts were a dolichocephalous race, and as they were such, M. de Belloguet's testimony to the brachycephaly of the French is worthy of all notice; for type of cranial conformation, from its remarkable persistence in a population, is allowed to be an important note in ethnology. M. Broca somewhere puts in the plea on behalf of round-headedness generally, that it may never have been done justice to, owing to the fact that craniology had been chiefly studied amongst the dolichocephalous races of Sweden, Germany, England, and America; and when we bear in mind the intelligence, the brilliant and ready wit, and many natural gifts of the French, we must deem his plea at least patriotic, and one not wholly unwarranted by facts. But this by-the-by, for the comparative merits of long and round-shaped skulls are wholly beside our purpose.

While, then, we allow the presence amongst the population of France of a Teutonic and a Scandinavian element, and of others no less foreign, but whose exact ethnic character is a matter of dispute, we may say generally, as to the wide extent of the country, that a short, brown, round-headed race prevails over a tall, fair, and long-headed one. That it does so argues, according to a principle Broca lays down, and which we fully accept, that it was the numerically predominant one when the intermixture to which it was subjected with a race of opposite type commenced. Otherwise, and apart from the principle of persistence of type and of the tendency of a mixed population to revert to its primitive type, we know not how to account for this remarkable phenomenon in the ethnology of the French. For the physical type of her sons France is more deeply indebted to her ancient Iberian and Ligurian populations, and above all to her prehistoric occupants with their rude implements and generally inferior civilization, than to her Celtic invaders who have left their mark upon the local nomenclature of by far the greater portion of the country, who have handed down many customs, and whose speech still survives in the remote peninsula, where in all probability it was first spoken more than thirty centuries ago.

---

## ART. IX.—SPIRITUALISM AND ITS EVIDENCES.

*Hints for the Evidences of Spiritualism.* By M.P. London : Trübner and Co., 60, Paternoster Row. 1872.

WE read in the little volume before us a story which may serve, in great measure, to explain the eagerness with which the evidences of spiritualism are caught up and credited. The Right Hon. John Bright, in the course of an "earnest conversation on the subject of spiritualism," after expressing the wonder he felt at Mr. Home's manifestations, and the difficulty there was in attributing them to any other cause than the action of intelligent disembodied spirits, added cautiously, "I do not say that this is so; but if it be true, it is the strongest tangible proof we have of immortality." We may doubt whether Mr. Bright's share in the earnest conversation has been quite accurately reported; but we may be sure that the words assigned to him might be assigned with perfect truth to a thousand others. Men, seeking after a sign, find one ready to their hands, if they can bring themselves to admit the credibility of spiritualistic miracles. Their faith in Moses and the prophets has grown a little doubtful; they are seeking for something nearer and more tangible than the record of events long gone by; and they find it in table-turning, in spirit-rapping, and in the thousand and one varied manifestations which display themselves at a successful séance.

Our author's purpose is to show that there exists the same kind of proof for modern miracles as for ancient ones; that there is no antecedent incredibility in them; and that there is a body of evidence in their favour so strong that no one can refuse to receive it, unless he is prepared to reject *all* human testimony, when it certifies to the supernatural. Having dealt with these points at some length, he devotes the remainder of his little volume to combating the principal objections which have been brought against spiritualism; and finally sums up, not indeed absolutely in its favour, but considering it, on a review of the whole evidence *pro* and *con*, as not undeserving the same serious attention as would be bestowed on any other narrative whatever which recorded the same marvels. It will be worth our while to follow his arguments in detail, and ascertain something of the evidences or apologies which may be offered for the new creed.

We must say, by way of commencement, that the argument throughout is *ad hominem*; it is addressed to those who already believe in a world of spirits, and believe too that at some period or other in the course of history there has been intercourse between that world and our own. This is the fundamental ad-

mission which the author expects from those who are to be convinced by his arguments. You allow, he says, that this sort of thing has happened in the past; you examine evidences, you admit the credibility of witnesses, and you believe their statements, in spite of all antecedent improbability, and in spite of the known tendency of mankind to lie on all subjects, and particularly where their falsehoods excite in others a strong sense of the marvellous. You are aware of the difficulties:—well, the difficulties I shall lay before you will be no greater. You believe the evidences in spite of their many acknowledged imperfections: I shall submit evidence at least as worthy of belief, and better capable of being tested by scientific methods. If, therefore, you give credence to ancient miracles, I call on you in all consistency not to reject modern miracles—at least, without as full a hearing. They are probable in themselves, particularly probable at the time when they are first alleged to have occurred. There is no creed whatever that rests upon such strong evidence; they have occurred in an enlightened age, and in the great centres of civilized life; they have been submitted to scientific tests, and have never yet been disproved; and, as for the numerous objections that have been made to them, we must consider in all fairness whether the same objections are not of far wider application, or whether they do not arise under such circumstances as in no way to discredit the phenomena. If all these points can be made out, the author calls on Jew, Turk, Pagan, and Christian—on all, in a word, except the absolute disbeliever in spirits and in all that has ever been asserted about them—to add a little to the roll of what they believe already, and not to close their eyes to the dawning light of a new revelation, certainly harmless, certainly consolatory, and possibly both true and useful.

And first as to the antecedent credibility of spiritual manifestations. The argument in its favour is not difficult, for there are very few to dispute it. In this most sceptics and philosophers are at one with the champions of orthodoxy. Hume, Reid, Brown, Huxley, Mill, and Mansel are here perfectly in accord. Their language fairly admits of being interpreted as laying down the position that we have no evidence which would warrant us in declaring a breach of the observed order of nature to be impossible. All alike are therefore bound to examine the evidences, and not to reject them *à priori* with contempt. The evidence may prove to be worth nothing, but it is not such necessarily, and is therefore entitled to a hearing from all candid reasoners, except indeed from those who have assumed *consistently* that whatever is miraculous is necessarily untrue and unhistorical.

"Be the case," says our author, "as it may with regard to sceptics in religion—to whom I do not wish to address myself in these pages

—it is evident that no *Christian* can assert that spiritualism is antecedently incredible, even should the manifestations be represented as miracles of the most stupendous character, inasmuch as it is part of the Christian case that no miracles whatever are antecedently incredible. If, on the other hand, as will presently be shown, the phenomena in question do not come before us in the light of miracles at all, but are merely asserted to be manifestations of ordinary, though hitherto only partially recognised and still incompletely observed laws, the most orthodox will admit that here is no case of antecedent incredibility or impossibility, but only it may be of *improbability*: and this antecedent improbability must necessarily be smaller than that which exists in the case of an alleged miracle.”—pp. 4, 5.

And further we learn from the Bible, from the consent of all nations civilized and savage, and from the wants of human nature, that there is some general probability in favour of the occurrence of spiritual phenomena at some time or other.

“Spirits, as every one knows, are of constant occurrence in the Old and New Testaments. An evil spirit tormented Saul, 1 Sam. xvi. 14—23. The spirit of Samuel appeared to the same Saul, through the instrumentality of what we should call a medium, 1 Sam. xxviii. 7—20. A spirit appeared to Eliphaz the Temanite, and spoke to him, Job iv. 15, 16. ‘Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God,’ says the apostle, 1 John iv. 1 (though it is true that a different sense may be given to *πνεῦμα* in this and other passages). In Matthew xxvii. 52, 53, the dead appear in considerable numbers, to the living. The appearance of *angels* is also frequent; and angels and spirits are coupled together in Acts xxiii. 8, 9, and apparently shown to be identical in Rev. xxii. 8, 9. In 1 Kings xix. 5, an angel *touches* Elijah. In Dan. ix. 21, an angel *touches* Daniel. It is not necessary to refer particularly to the evil spirits cast out by Christ, who speak audibly, and are capable of setting in motion the bodies of animals. Both Paul and John appear to have been snatched out of the body, miraculously indeed, but still under conditions not altogether dissimilar from those of modern clairvoyance. Philip, on another occasion, was bodily taken up and removed to a considerable distance.”—pp. 6, 7. \*

“If we were specially ordered by the Almighty not to raise dead people from the graves, and were moreover told by him that he was about to bestow upon us the land now occupied by the French, because of the prevailing habit of doing this very thing in France, raising the dead would be a power appertaining to man, and liable to be constantly exercised by him. Similarly, communion with evil spirits, or spirits of any kind, if it was such a constant and everyday practice as it appears to have been in those times, must have been in accordance with natural laws.”—pp. 8, 9.

“Now, in the minds of those who believe in the truth of the occurrences just mentioned, there cannot be even a sense or feeling of general improbability as attaching to spiritual manifestations. There can only be a sense of its being *improbable that they should occur at*



*the present day or in the future* : since it is not open to them to dispute that past generations, and indeed whole nations, have had experience of them."—pp. 9, 10.

"The position of sceptics on this subject is, of course, a simple and a logical one. They affirm that no such manifestations have ever taken place ; that their existence was as much a delusion in the case of the Jews and the Philistines, as it was on the part of Matthew Hopkins and the New Englanders. There can be no question as to the cessation of what never had a being. But Christians, or at any rate Protestants, may, I think, fairly have their attention called to this query, ' Man having once acquired this remarkable power, how came he to lose it ? ' "—p. 17.

Certainly, if these manifestations have happened in the past they may happen again, and the present hour may chance to be the very one in which they are occurring.

And there are many reasons that may lead us to this conclusion. If the probability of a new revelation is to be measured by the need which exists for it, no hour could be more auspicious than the present. Faith in the unseen world has grown cold and heartless. Men speak and think and act as if there were no reality beyond the present life, as if death were the be-all and end-all of existence. And what proof can be offered to the contrary more convincing than the actual reappearance of the spirits of the departed ? From whom can we gain more sure tidings of the other world than from those who have just come thence, and can relate their story with the certainty of eye-witnesses ? We may therefore conclude with confidence that the manifestations of spiritualism are very necessary indeed to give new faith to a faithless and unbelieving age ; and that, if their reality is sufficiently attested, they give the most ample proof that could be desired by the coldest adherent of the most sceptical philosophy. The phenomena are at once necessary and sufficient—a strong *à priori* argument that they are genuine.

"It can scarcely be doubted—so I think the future apologist might very fairly argue—that at the period when spiritualism is said to have been introduced into the modern world as a new system of belief, the popular faith in the immortality of the soul had, to say the least, become extremely vague. It is true that sermons by the cartload were preached on the subject, and prayers were offered up, and inscriptions were carved on tombs, and resurgams put up in front of houses, and the tenet was nominally held by hundreds of Christian sects ; but to those who penetrate beneath the surface, it is clear that the kind of belief evidenced by these facts was of a very loose and unsatisfactory character—that it did not come home to the hearts of men with a sense of definite reality. The literature of the period, when carefully examined, and still more the language and the habits of everyday life, will confirm this view."—p. 23.

"Nor, in considering this subject, can we fail to notice that there

had arisen about this very time a considerable number of persons who altogether denied the truth of divine revelation, and, by consequence, anything like an *assurance* of a future state. Only a few years before the rise of modern spiritualism, a nation, in many respects the foremost in the world, had gone a step further, and on the walls of the capital of Europe might be read the words, 'Death is an eternal sleep.' 'Ma demeure sera bientôt le néant,' said Danton, when asked for his address before the Revolutionary Tribunal. The teachings of the great German philosophers Hegel, Schelling, and their disciples, Feuerbach, &c., were fatal to any conception of *individual immortality*. The old beliefs which had sustained the Christian world for eighteen centuries were evidently enfeebled, and the attacks on them had increased in number and in power."—pp. 28, 29.

"Wherever we look we shall find evidence of the rapid progress of infidelity, and the testimony is strongest, not in the pages of professed sceptics (who might be expected to magnify their own success), but in the utterances of orthodox watchmen like Dean Goulburn. Mr. Farrar, in his 'Witness of History to Christ,' tells us that in the previous century the attacks on Christianity were rare. 'It is not so now,' he writes in 1871; 'we are, as it were, in the very focus of the storm. It is not that every now and then there is a burst of thunder and a glare of lightning, but the whole air is electric with quivering flames.' He adds, further on, that the most vital principles of Christian doctrine have to be defended *against whole literatures, against whole philosophies*' (p. 6). And so Mr. Mozeley speaks of the "intellectual movement against miracles" ('On Miracles,' p. 2), and Mr. Liddon informs us that 'No one can doubt the existence of a widespread unsettlement of religious belief' (Preface to second edition of 'Divinity of our Lord,' p. 15); and again, in terms as strong as those used by Mr. Farrar, he exclaims, 'Never, since the first ages of the gospel, was fundamental Christian truth denied and denounced so largely, and with such passionate animosity, as is the case at this moment in each of the most civilized nations of Europe' (p. 498)."—pp. 31, 32.

"When we contemplate a society whose religious belief might thus be exhibited as in a state of disintegration, what can seem more likely than that a new and more comforting assurance should be given to man of the most important of all truths to him—the immortality of the soul? At any rate, I for one fail altogether to see any unlikelihood in the supposition."—p. 33.

But all these are merely preparatory considerations. The strongest proofs remain yet to be adduced. It is not enough to show that a thing is likely; we ought to show that it has actually happened.

"If the dogma that John Jones got drunk at the Red Lion on a particular night is to be instilled into me on pain of damnation, you are quite right in clearing away the ground by showing me that it was *possible* for John Jones to get drunk (supposing that I am likely to dispute that proposition). You may then proceed, if you please, to

show that it was *probable* that he would get drunk—(1.) Generally. He had often got drunk before; he came of a tipsy family, &c. (2.) In the precise manner alleged. His way lay past the door of the ale-house on that evening; he had quarrelled with his wife, and was out of sorts from having lost his pig, and so was more likely to fall into temptation, &c., &c. I do not say that these circumstances are unworthy of attention, but, since standing by themselves they will fail to carry conviction to my mind, if, as you say, you have the testimony of a number of respectable and disinterested persons, who, at the alleged time and place, saw John Jones drink twelve tumblers of gin-and-water, and then go tottering and hiccuping along the street, you had better produce them without more ado.”—pp. 39-41.

And on this point too the disciples of spiritualism will be found not unprepared. They can certainly adduce a most respectable body of witnesses—respectable both for their numbers and the deep earnestness of their convictions. They do not shrink from inquiry; rather they court it, so only that it be fair and patient. And the thing is not done in a corner. If the facts alleged happen anywhere, they happen in places where the fullest examination is possible, and where they can be subjected to the keenest and most sceptical intelligence; and where they have been so tested they have survived the test, and remain still, if not established, at least not disproved.

“What are these narratives which flow in upon us from all parts of the Christian world with such a consensus, and from so many independent sources, that, according to Professor Challis, if they are not admitted to be true, ‘the possibility of certifying facts by human testimony must be given up?’ What is it that these millions of witnesses depose to? Their evidence is to the effect that heavy dining-tables have risen several feet above the ground, and remained suspended in the air without visible means of support; that they have been rendered alternately so light that they could be raised from the carpet ‘like a sheet of paper,’ and so heavy that they could with difficulty be moved; chairs have glided mysteriously over the floor, ponderous pieces of furniture have been carried along ‘as a leaf is carried by the wind on a turnpike road.’”—p. 53.

“Nor have such astounding effects been produced upon walls and articles of furniture only. There exist numerous well-authenticated instances of the human body being carried into space—a result which no conjuring could bring about. Thus, in the presence of Lord Lindsay, Lord Adair, and Mr. Bergheim, on July 11, 1871, Mr. Home was carried out of one window of a room seventy feet from the ground and brought in at another window. The moon was shining full into the room, and Mr. Home was seen ‘floating in the air outside the window.’”—pp. 54, 55.

“Long before this, Mr. Home had been seen to rise in the air, and pass out of one open window into another in a house near the Victoria Railway Station, and had been observed by one witness on another

occasion '*gliding in the air several feet above the ground.*' Mr. E. L. Blanchard, the well-known author, testifies to having been 'uplifted by the spirits himself, and kept for some time in the air.' Mr. J. Jones, of Enmore Park, South Norwood, has seen chairs floating to the air, and had also 'seen his own mother, an aged lady, raised off the ground chair and all, by invisible agencies. *These things all occurred in the presence of many witnesses.*'—pp. 55, 56.

"At the house of Mrs. Berry, on the 16th of December, 1870, 'her niece, Miss Berry, was floated in the air.' On the 31st of May, at 74, Navarino, Dalston, Miss Cook, of Hackney, was not only floated in the air, but 'carried about the room.' These facts are testified to by eye-witnesses."—p. 56.

Nor can any great weight be assigned to the various preliminary objections which have been urged against them. It is true that some of their teachers have been impostors; but what religion is there against which this could not be alleged? And all for their being not supernatural, but the result of some unknown law of nature,—what, it may be asked, are the miracles which have not been thus explained away? No martyrs, it is true, have borne their testimony to their truth, but this may fairly be accounted for if we remember that an age of toleration is not an age of martyrdom. The willing victim may yet possibly be found, but it will be more difficult to find the willing executioner; and if he is found, the law will step in and shelter the new confessors from his fury. Two persons are as necessary for a martyrdom as they are proverbially for a quarrel, and we must know which of the two is wanting before we can accuse spiritualists of not being ready to seal their testimony with their blood. And so on through the whole list of objections. We shall find either that the objection admits of being explained away, or that, if we admit it, we must go further, and allow its force against other creeds and other marvels than those only which the spiritualist teaches and believes.

"If it is to be no bar to our accepting revelation that it contains many things unlikely to happen, and even absurd in our eyes, so likewise the occurrence of the same sort of things in spiritualism constitutes no objection to our receiving *that*. We are in both cases, as always happens, driven back upon the evidence, 'Are these things true?' And we have ventured to submit that, if evidence is to be allowed the same weight here as has been conceded to it elsewhere, they are proved to be true."—pp. 83, 84.

And again:—

"It is quite clear that miraculous gifts and spiritualistic gifts were never intended to be conferred for any other purpose than the *establishment of certain truths*, and were not meant to exempt their possessors from the necessity of earning their livelihood in the ordinary way. I learn from spiritual publications that injudicious at-

tempts to lure spirits into giving advice on pecuniary matters have been uniformly unsuccessful. And this is just what—supposing spiritualism to be true—I should expect.”—p. 94.

As for the objection that the narratives of these phenomena are given to us by partisans of spiritualism, and are therefore open to suspicion, our author deals with it as follows :—

“By whom would you have them to be given? Who were Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and Paul? It might as well be objected to the narrative of any miracle—*e.g.*, a corpse being re-animated—that it came to us from the persons who were present and saw (or believed they saw) the dead man raised from the grave, and were thereupon converted to the religion of the wonder-worker. Whereas, if the whole affair be not a pure invention, these were the only possible witnesses to the facts—the *inference* which they drew from them being of course a fair subject for discussion. And so with the alleged phenomena of spiritualism.”—p. 96.

“It must be added that *nearly the whole of the evidence which we possess on this subject comes to us from persons who commenced their investigations as strong disbelievers in spiritualism, and who were converted by what they witnessed.* We have their own repeated assurances to this effect. In the days of the apostles, as we have seen, there was hardly such a thing as scepticism on the subject of miracles, or ‘wonders’ of any kind; the only doubt being whether the particular person claiming the power to work them really possessed that power, a form of uncertainty which would yield to much slighter evidence than a general disbelief (such as the witnesses to spiritualism nearly always started with) as to the existence of any such powers, or the reality of any such phenomena.”—p. 97.

We ask, in conclusion, with what purpose is this little volume written? It is certainly the work of a man of great ability, accustomed to close reasoning, able to trace out analogies, and to weigh evidence, and able, too, to express his views in clear and consistent language. Does he intend to profess a genuine belief in spiritualism, and to submit arguments calculated to persuade others, or at least to forbid them from indulging in the easy scorn with which an incredulous world is ever ready to cover the teachers of what is at once new and marvellous? Or does he purpose rather to involve all supernatural creeds in a common ruin, and to insist that men shall be consistent in their doubts rather than in their assurance, and that, if they reject the facts and tenets of the modern spiritualist, they shall carry the same method and the same temper to the examination of all evidence which deals in any way with the miraculous?

# ART. X.—THE DISTRIBUTION OF REPRESENTATION.

1. *Preliminary Report and Tables of the Population, and Houses Enumerated, in England and Wales on 3rd April, 1871.*
2. *Return of the Number of Electors on the Parliamentary Register of the United Kingdom. 1872.*
3. *Report of the Boundary Commissioners. 1868.*

**I**T is strange that no one in the Reformed House of Commons has as yet taken up the question of the unequal distribution of our parliamentary representation ; this is so closely connected with the inequalities that exist in the right to the franchise, that they may be said to form a single subject. The present distribution of representatives has no reference to the number, the wealth, or the intelligence of those they represent ; the right to the possession of a vote does not depend upon personal qualification, but upon an accidental line of boundary. The whole arrangement is, to a great extent, the result of accident, and it constitutes a blemish in our representative system as hurtful in its consequences, as it is indefensible in theory.

In this case happily there are no vested interests, such as obstructed the abolition of purchase, to interfere with any alteration that may be deemed just and expedient. There is not either any difficulty or even any difference of opinion as to the nature of the alteration required. Every measure of redistribution that has been adopted, from that of Cromwell to Mr. Disraeli's, every scheme that has been proposed from that of Lord Chatham to Mr. Bright's, has followed the same course. All who at the present day advocate any change, from the ultra-Radical to the moderate Conservative, start from the same principle, and that is, that the number of representatives must, in a greater or less degree, be equalized to the number represented. No doubt there have always been, and there will always be, differences of opinion as to the extent to which such a reform should be carried ; but the remedy for the mischief complained of, if any remedy is to be applied, consists, and can only consist, in taking members from the small and giving them to the large constituencies.

Although the subject has not been brought before the present Parliament as a substantive motion, it has on various occasions been referred to in the House of Commons by ministers and ex-ministers, as well as by independent members, in such a manner as to show that the more far-seeing among them are convinced

that our present system of representation is merely "provisional," and that an early modification of it is inevitable. Even a cursory glance at some of the results exhibited in the returns of the last census might convince the most conservatively inclined among us that all attempts to maintain it in its existing condition, must prove futile. The metropolis of this vast empire contains a population of upwards of three millions, who certainly are not surpassed either in wealth or in intelligence by any portion of their fellow-countrymen. They are represented in the great council of the nation by twenty-two members; but these twenty-two representatives may be outvoted upon any question of the most vital importance by the representatives of twenty-three so-called boroughs, rather country villages, the whole aggregate population of which amounts to 135,076; the largest of these is Eye, with a population of 6721.\* There are seventeen towns in England, beyond the metropolis, with a population above 100,000, whose aggregate population exceeds three millions and a quarter; they have thirty-seven representatives. These also might in the same manner be outvoted by the representatives of thirty-eight small boroughs, the aggregate population of which amounts to 241,250; the largest of these, Bewdley, has 7610 inhabitants.\* The metropolis and the large towns together have a population of 6,277,602, with fifty-nine representatives, but their vote counts for less on a division than the vote of fifty-eight small boroughs with a population of 417,003. Indeed, if we take into consideration that the large constituencies are rapidly increasing in population, while the small are stationary or actually decreasing, we shall not be far wrong in saying that the odd hundreds of thousands of the former, disarding the six millions altogether, exceed the whole population of the latter.

We subjoin for the sake of comparison two lists, one of the metropolitan boroughs and towns with a population above 100,000, the other of fifty-six boroughs with a population below 10,000, each of which still returns one member; to the latter we have added the two smallest boroughs still returning two members.

---

\* Eye, a small village in Suffolk, had at the last census 2396 inhabitants; the population of the parliamentary borough is made up to 6721 by throwing in the ten adjacent parishes. Bewdley, a village in Worcestershire, had at the last census 3018 inhabitants. The population of the parliamentary borough is made up in a similar manner. Both places have decreased since the first Reform Bill.

*Boroughs above 100,000.*

*Metropolitan.*

Members.		Pop.
2	Marylebone ...	477,555
2	Finsbury ...	443,316
2	Tower Hamlets ...	391,568
2	Lambeth ...	379,112
2	Hackney ...	362,427
2	Chelsea ...	258,011
2	Westminster ...	246,413
2	Southwark ...	207,335
2	Greenwich ...	167,632
4	City ...	74,732
<hr/>		
22		3,008,101

*Extra-Metropolitan.*

3	Liverpool ...	493,346
3	Manchester ...	383,843
3	Birmingham ...	343,696
3	Leeds ...	259,201
2	Sheffield ...	239,947
2	Bristol ...	182,526
2	Wolverhampton ...	163,408
2	Bradford ...	145,887
2	Stoke ...	130,507
2	Newcastle ...	128,160
2	Salford ...	124,805
2	Hull ...	123,111
1	Wednesbury ...	116,768
2	Oldham ...	113,092
2	Portsmouth ...	112,954
2	Sunderland ...	104,490
2	Brighton ...	103,760
<hr/>		
37		3,269,501

*Boroughs under 10,000.*

Members.		Pop.
1	Evesham ...	4,887
1	Northallerton ...	4,961
1	Marlborough ...	5,034
1	Knarborough ...	5,205
1	Calne ...	5,315
1	Lymington ...	5,356
1	Richmond ...	5,364
1	Tewkesbury ...	5,409
1	Launceston ...	5,467
1	Thirsk ...	5,735
1	Andover ...	5,744
1	Leominster ...	5,865
1	Petersfield ...	6,103
1	Harwich ...	6,107
1	Ludlow ...	6,203
1	Brecknock ...	6,291
1	Westbury ...	6,395
1	Wareham ...	6,532
1	Liskeard ...	6,575
1	Abingdon ...	6,583
1	Huntingdon ...	6,605
1	Marlow ...	6,619
1	Eye ...	6,721
1	Midhurst ...	6,756
1	Bodmin ...	6,758
1	Ripon ...	6,805
1	Devizes ...	6,840
1	Chippenham ...	6,880
1	Malmesbury ...	6,880
1	Dorchester ...	6,915
1	Malden ...	6,927
1	Radnor ...	7,041
1	Cockermouth ...	7,057
1	Bridgenorth ...	7,303
1	Lichfield ...	7,380
1	Woodstock ...	7,477
1	Buckingham ...	7,545
1	Bewdley ...	7,610
1	Bridport ...	7,666
1	Cirencester ...	7,681
1	Tavistock ...	7,720
1	Horsham ...	7,831
1	Hertford ...	7,896
1	Stamford ...	8,086
1	Malton ...	8,186
1	Rye ...	8,288
1	Wallingford ...	8,353
1	Helston ...	8,791
1	Newport ...	8,829
1	Wilton ...	8,865
1	Shaftesbury ...	8,929



Members.	Pop.	Members.	Pop.
		1 Chichester ...	9,079
		1 Haverfordwest ...	9,466
		1 Droitwich ...	9,510
		1 Frome ...	9,752
		1 Guildford ...	9,801
22 Metropolitan ...	3,008,101	2 Tiverton ...	10,025
37 Extra-Metropolitan	3,269,501	2 Truro ...	10,999
59	6,277,602	60	417,003

Thus it is simply the fact that, taking the large and small boroughs in the aggregate, one man in the latter avails as much in political weight as twenty in the former. If we make the comparison between the largest and the smallest constituencies, the difference is still greater. Take for instance the first on the list of the large and compare it with the two first on the list of the small towns; we shall find that Evesham and Northallerton have conjointly a population of 9848 souls, and return the same number of representatives as Marylebone with a population of 477,555, and that consequently the inhabitants of these two interesting little villages have as much influence in regulating the destinies of the country as fifty times their number residing in the capital. This incidentally illustrates what we shall have to insist upon at greater length hereafter. The two members for Evesham and Northallerton are Tories, and the two members for Marylebone are Liberals, consequently on any division the vote of the 9848 "rurals" of Evesham and Northallerton might cancel the vote of the 477,555 citizens of Marylebone.

Another of the curiosities of our representation is this: there are fifteen boroughs, with a population exceeding 40,000, that only return one member, while there are twenty-five, with a population of less than 20,000, that return two members. In the former, there is one representative for 60,000 inhabitants, in the latter, one member for 7000. We subjoin a list of these also placed side by side.

Members.	Pop.	Members.	Pop.
1 Wednesbury...	116,768	2 Tiverton ...	10,025
1 Dudley ...	82,803	2 Truro ...	10,999
1 Swansea ...	80,937	2 Warwick ...	11,001
1 Huddersfield ...	74,358	2 Pontefract ...	11,242
1 Birkenhead ...	65,980	2 Tamworth ...	11,502
1 Rochdale ...	63,473	2 Barnstaple ...	11,790
1 Dewsbury ...	54,943	2 Newark ...	12,218
1 Walsall ...	49,023	2 Berwick ...	12,231
1 Gateshead ...	48,592	2 Grantham ...	12,248
1 Middlesbrough ...	46,643	2 Weymouth ...	12,257
1 Shields ...	44,722	2 Salisbury ...	12,848
1 Cheltenham ...	44,519	2 Winchester ...	14,705

Members.		Pop.	Members.		Pop.
1	Chatham ... ..	44,135	2	Durham ... ..	14,833
1	Burnley ... ..	44,107	2	Sandwich ... ..	14,916
1	Bury ... ..	41,517	2	St. Edmunds ... ..	14,928
			2	Taunton ... ..	15,466
			2	Newcastle ... ..	15,949
			2	Stafford ... ..	15,946
			2	Penrhyu ... ..	16,819
			2	Bedford ... ..	16,849
			2	Lynn... ..	17,163
			2	Peterborough ... ..	17,429
			2	Rochester ... ..	18,144
			2	Boston ... ..	18,289
			2	Hereford ... ..	18,355
15		902,520	50		362,152

Hence it appears that Tiverton, with 10,025 inhabitants, counts for as much in electoral importance as Wednesbury and Dudley together, with their population of 200,000, and that the whole fifteen, with their population of nearly a million, are more than counterbalanced by the first eight on the opposite side, whose whole population does not amount to 100,000. Yet even these lists give a very inadequate idea of the real insignificance of the generality of the small boroughs; their actual population does not in many cases amount to one-half of that comprised within the limits of the Parliamentary borough, which have been extended so as to include a large portion of the surrounding agricultural district. Twenty-six of the boroughs, with a population less than 10,000, contain upwards of 10,000 acres of land within their bounds. Eleven others contain between 5000 and 10,000 acres. The three Welsh boroughs are collections of separate villages, four of these, with unpronounceable names, go to make up the borough of Radnor. Some other boroughs, which figure as considerable towns, are in reality as insignificant as the smallest in the above lists; from the wide extent of their boundaries they in fact are small counties. The two boroughs of Retford and Cricklade together, are considerably larger than the two counties of Huntingdon and Rutland. If in any future measure of disfranchisement 10,000 should be taken as the limit below which no town should return a member, these ought by no means to escape, since they merely exceed that limit from having had a large portion of the surrounding country thrown into their bounds. Old Sarum and Gatton might easily have been preserved if this principle had been applied to them; in like manner Calne might be made to figure as a borough with a population of 20,000. The following is a list of those agricultural boroughs whose population is carried above the limit of

10,000, by reason of their unduly extended boundaries ; all of them it will be seen, except St. Ives, contain more than 10,000 acres. The population within the Municipal limits is given when stated in the returns of the census :—

Members.		Acres.		Pop. Par.		Pop. Municipal
2	Retford...	207,906	...	49,095	...	3,494
2	Cricklade	158,777	...	43,552	...	6,034
2	Shoreham	112,287	...	37,463	...	—
2	Aylesbury	69,181	...	28,760	...	—
2	Wenlock	51,246	...	21,283	...	2,531
1	Morpeth	17,325	...	30,189	...	4,510
1	Christchurch	22,350	...	15,415	...	—
1	Clitheroe	16,026	...	11,786	...	8,217
2	Tiverton	17,491	...	10,025	...	—
2	Tamworth	11,602	...	11,502	...	4,589
1	St. Ives...	8,427	...	10,034	...	7,007

18

These inequalities of representation are not confined to the boroughs ; they are manifested in nearly as glaring a manner in the county constituencies. The six smallest county constituencies have a population of 306,867, with twelve representatives, being one for 25,000 ; the six largest also have twelve representatives, but they have a population of 1,948,951, being one for 162,000. Here, as well as in the boroughs, we cannot fail to be struck by the fact that those places which are in a backward and declining condition are enormously over-represented ; while those towns and districts to whose energy and industry it is owing that England holds the place she does in the world, are grievously under-represented. The different measure that has been meted out to our agricultural and to our industrial constituencies, is highly suggestive as to the class which has legislated for us in times past. We subjoin a list of the six largest and the six smallest county constituencies, with their population, and the number of their members.

Members.	Pop.	Members.	Pop.
2	Lancashire, S.E.	2	Rutland ...
2	Lancashire, S.W.	2	Westmoreland ...
2	West Riding, S.	2	Northumberland, N....
2	West Riding, N.	2	Huntingdon ...
2	West Riding, E.	2	Sussex, W. ...
2	Middlesex ...	2	Worcester ...
12	1,948,951	12	306,867

In the above list the county constituency alone is given ; the population of the represented cities and boroughs being excluded. In the following list we shall give the *entire* population of our

four largest counties brought into juxtaposition with eleven other counties that return a larger number of representatives ; the entire population of these also is given ; they are not in any way picked out or selected for the purpose of making the comparison more striking, but all are contiguous to each other, in the centre of England.

Members.		Pop.	Members.		Pop.
19	Middlesex ...	2,538,682	15	Wilts ...	257,202
11	Surrey ...	1,090,270	10	Dorset ...	195,544
32	Lancashire ...	2,818,904	11	Somerset ...	463,412
22	West Riding ...	1,831,223	8	Berks ...	196,445
			9	Oxford ...	177,956
			8	Buckingham... ..	175,870
			4	Bedford ...	146,256
			7	Cambridge ...	186,363
			3	Huntingdon... ..	63,672
			2	Rutland ...	22,070
			8	Northampton ...	243,896
<hr/>			<hr/>		
84		8,279,079	85		2,128,686

From this it appears that the large district extending from the Bill of Portland to the Wash, which is of a purely agricultural character, has one representative for 25,000 inhabitants, while in our two great centres of commercial and manufacturing enterprise, there is only one representative for 100,000 inhabitants. If we make the comparison between particular counties, the difference is more palpably unjust. Wiltshire has a representation almost equal to that of Middlesex, and yet the latter has tenfold the population of the former.

If it is admitted, and it can hardly be denied, that the object of representative institutions is to enable the national will to manifest itself, so that the government of the country may be carried on, and laws may be framed in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the people, what defence can be made for such a distribution of representation as this ? It is obvious that our present system might entirely fail in fulfilling the very end for which representative government exists. We might have a majority in the House of Commons that represented, not the majority, but an almost insignificant minority of the nation. This is not an imaginary danger ; as a matter of fact at the present moment fifty out of the fifty-nine representatives of the large towns are Liberals, while the strength of the Conservatives is drawn from the small boroughs and small county constituencies ; a very slight, and far from impossible, change in the representation of a few insignificant country towns, famous for anything but purity or independence, might give a Tory majority at the next general

election; and this, even although the large towns and large county constituencies should prove more thoroughly Liberal than they are at the present moment. Should this be the case, and should a party eager for the possession of political power attempt to carry on the Government, relying upon a majority in Parliament that did not represent a majority of the nation, it would be fraught with the gravest danger, not merely to the institutions of our country, but what is of far more serious consequence, to that peaceful development of our political progress, which has so favourably distinguished England from all other European countries for nearly two centuries. The attempt to rely upon a Parliamentary in place of a national majority cost Louis Philippe his throne, and plunged France into that series of revolutions alternating with *coup d'états*, that state of anarchy tempered by despotism, that has formed the history of that country since February, 1848. When Sir R. Peel heard of that event, he said to Mr. Cobden, "This is what the Protectionists wanted me to do; and now we may see what the consequences would have been." Is it altogether impossible that a minister less sagacious and patriotic than Sir R. Peel might make an attempt similar to that of M. Guizot, trusting, as many a ruler has done ere now, that things might go on as they were for his time, and, after that, the Deluge?

Even if we confine our attention to our own country, and to the last forty years, though we may not discover any case in which the House of Commons has long remained in direct opposition to a strong expression of public opinion, we shall find that there have been many instances in which a majority of the nation in favour of a particular measure has not found expression in a majority of its representatives. The ballot was one of these. From the days of the first Reformed Parliament down to this year, it has always commanded a majority of the representatives of the large towns sufficient to have insured its being passed into law if they had had their fair share of representation. In 1841 the large towns pronounced, almost unanimously, in favour of free trade, yet a majority of nearly one hundred was returned in favour of protection. Nor can it, with truth, be asserted that the majority for the ballot and free trade existing in the large towns was counterbalanced by an opposite majority in the large counties; at that time the suffrage in the counties was limited to the freeholders and 50*l.* occupiers, who were chiefly farmers, tenants at will; there can be no doubt that the majority of the industrial population of the counties of Middlesex, Lancashire, and the West Riding were as much opposed to the corn laws as the inhabitants of the large towns. It was the knowledge of this

that induced Sir R. Peel to speak as he did to Mr. Cobden. But we need not go back to 1846; only the other day Mr. Mundella affirmed at the meeting of the trades' union delegates at Nottingham, that the alteration, so distasteful to the working classes, which was made in the Criminal Amendment Law of last session by the House of Lords, was adopted in the House of Commons by a majority who represented a smaller number of constituents than their opponents. We shall probably find this to be the case also with the question of the payment of school fees in denominational schools, at least if we take only the borough members; and this we may fairly do, for the present county franchise gives no assurance that the members chosen by counties represent the opinions of the majority of their inhabitants.

Under our present system of representation it is absolutely impossible for the dwellers in our urban districts, the essentially liberal and progressive portion of our population, to secure the adoption of any measure of social or political reform without entering upon a long, costly, and painful agitation. The House of Commons ought to be an exact index of the public mind upon all questions relating to the public welfare. But so far is this from being the case, that the advocates of new measures, even when they are unquestionably approved of by a majority of the community, or at least by the majority of those who form an opinion on political matters, are almost invariably driven to hold monster meetings and threatening demonstrations before they can induce Parliament to believe that a majority of the nation is in favour of the desired legislation. A Conservative member of Parliament declared to his constituents a few months before the Park palings went down in 1866, that he had never met a single person who desired Reform. In a speech to his fellow-townsmen of Rochdale, in 1859, Mr. Bright expressed, with his habitual clearness and force, the evils that attend a representative system such as this. He said:—

“If you want any great measure now, what is the process for obtaining it? You generally have to contend for it up to the point of civil war. This has become so much the custom in this country that the ruling class never believe that you are in earnest until you get up to that point. Now they tell you the people don't care about Reform. You don't find 100,000 men assemble on Newhall Hill in Birmingham—you don't find men assemble in vast multitudes in Lancashire and Yorkshire, and threaten that if the Bill be not granted in the course of a week's time they will be on their march to London. Of course not, and I hope nothing of the kind will come, for I hope nothing of the kind will be necessary; but the fact that they taunt us with the absence of this, is a proof that they are, however unconscious of it, influenced by the notion, and in fact by the knowledge, that no great

thing is ever wrested from the Government of this country by the people, except it be at the point of violent action. We are like subjects contending with a conqueror; like the Irish Catholics contending with the invading and subjugating Protestant; like the Lombard, if it be so, contending with the Austrian. When you got the Reform Bill you were within twenty-four hours of a revolution. When you got the Corn Bill, in 1846, you had the help of the most stupendous famine that for many hundreds of years had visited any civilized country of the world. And now, if you want a measure, how do you get it? Take now the questions of minor importance. Take church-rates for example, which is much more a matter of sentiment than pecuniary importance to anybody. It is a mark of subjugation, and therefore we resent it; but for twenty years the church-rate question has been debated in the House of Commons. The argument was as plain twenty years ago as it is now, but the rate was not abolished. Take again the question of the ballot. Immediately after the Reform Bill, the speeches in favour of the ballot were as overwhelming in point of argument as they have ever been since. Nothing has exceeded the logic and power of argument displayed by Mr. Grote upon that question after the Reform Bill; but the ballot is not yet the law of the land. The House of Lords and its three-fourths of the House of Commons vote, year after year, anything they like. There may be an enormous majority of the people in favour of any particular course, but you want a majority which almost comprises the whole, with your present distribution of members, to carry any great measure of reform in the House of Commons. Before Sir R. Peel repealed the corn laws, Mr. Villiers, I believe, never had more than one hundred members in favour of the repeal, and yet everybody knows that although one hundred members do not represent one-sixth of the House of Commons, five out of six of the actual population of the United Kingdom had long condemned the corn laws. This is a proof that we have not at present a real representation of the people."

The facts and figures given above demonstrate that our representation is still as far removed, we do not say from a perfect system, but even from one calculated in any fair and adequate degree to represent the opinion of the country, as it was at the time Mr. Bright was speaking; and the history of every important measure of legislation that has been passed, or has not been passed, since then proves the justness of his observations. Household suffrage, which had long been supported by the nearly unanimous vote of the representatives of our urban constituencies, was not extorted from Parliament till an agitation had been inaugurated that almost culminated in violence; nor till a Conservative government and the Conservative party was forced to pass a measure of democratic reform which they had spent their lives in opposing. The Disestablishment of the Irish Church, and the Irish Land Bill were only carried when Fenianism no longer permitted our rulers to turn a deaf ear to

the wrongs endured by the people of Ireland. Purchase in the Army was only got rid of when the country was suffering from an invasion panic. Had it been left to the members of our large towns, all these four measures would have been carried forty years ago, and our legislature would have been spared the discredit of appearing to pass laws under the influence of fear, which they had refused to pass from a sense of justice. The abolition of purchase would not then have cost one-half of what it will now. The adoption of the two remedial measures affecting Ireland would probably have exercised a really healing influence on that country if they had been passed soon after Catholic Emancipation, at a time when proofs of goodwill could not have been mistaken for signs of alarm. If we look at some measures that have not yet passed, but that ought to have passed years ago and left the field free for legislation upon other subjects, we find the same story—an unreasoning dogged resistance that will not listen to argument is offered to every plan of improvement, merely because it is change, by all those who are interested in the maintenance of existing institutions; and this is continued until such a demonstration of public opinion is made that it is not considered safe to resist. The defeated obstructives, the rurals sent up by the rotten boroughs and agricultural districts, then retire behind some other bulwark of privilege, or of ancient abuse, and defend it as long as it is tenable. It was in this way that long after the opinion of the country had been formed and pronounced, the admission of the Jews into Parliament, and of the dissenters into the universities was delayed by the representatives of an interested and bigoted minority, while the time of the legislature was taken up year after year in the same fruitless discussions. A Hercules of Reform, capable of turning the whole stream of democracy upon an abuse, is required, as things now are, to effect the slightest reform that trenches upon existing privileges, or diminishes an atom of the inordinate power of the ruling class in this country.

The Reform Bill of 1832 did not give the large towns anything like a fair share in the representation of the country. Still the measure of disfranchisement and enfranchisement proposed by the Grey Government was probably as comprehensive as the country was ripe for, as large as could have been carried without actual revolution. That Act took 148 members from the small boroughs, and gave them, in equal proportions, to the large towns, previously unrepresented, and to the counties. Since then the population of the metropolitan boroughs, and of the towns enfranchised by the Reform Bill, has more than doubled, while the population of the small boroughs and of the agricultural districts has been stationary or receding. Yet when



the second Reform Bill was passed in 1867, under the auspices of Mr. Disraeli, only three additional seats were given to these towns, two to the Tower Hamlets, and one to Salford. It is true that Chelsea and ten other places were erected into Parliamentary boroughs; but this operation eliminated a portion of the country population that rendered the landlords' hold over the counties less secure. Besides, these new boroughs received only twelve of the members taken from the boroughs that suffered reduction, while the counties, with their population diminished both by the creation of the new boroughs and by the rectification of the boundaries of others, received an accession of twenty-eight members.

We do not forget that four additional representatives were given to Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, and Leeds; but this was combined with the scheme for giving the minority a share in the representation. We do not propose to discuss the merits of that scheme, or of others, such as that of Mr. Hare, which appears better adapted for the attainment of the object sought for. We merely wish here to point out how it has affected the distribution of political power between the urban and rural districts. Before Mr. Disraeli and the House of Lords hit upon this plan for weakening the large cities, the vote for Manchester and Leeds was equal on a division to that of Truro and Tiverton; but now that there is a Conservative minority representative for each of these cities, they might both, on an important occasion, such as a vote of want of confidence in the ministry, pair off with one of their colleagues, and the entire vote of Manchester and Leeds conjoined would on the division amount to two—precisely equal to that of Truro, which has now the happiness of being represented by a couple of Tories. The vote of these two cities would be cancelled by that of Truro. Certainly our people is a long-suffering and forbearing one, or the inhabitants of our great cities would not have endured that such a slight and wrong should have been inflicted upon them, or that it should have remained now for five years unredressed.

The distribution of representation is a subject that ought to engage the sympathy, and call forth the energetic action of every Liberal among us, even of those who may have no fancy for theoretical perfection or for constitutions after the Abbé Siéyès. For the obstructive element in the legislature of this country is so strong that even when a Liberal measure is brought forward by the Government, they find it most difficult to carry it through, and rarely succeed in so doing without having it crippled or marred by the party of the oligarchy. Each one of the Liberal measures of the last three sessions affords abundant proof of this. And only the other day Mr. Foster informed a deputation

that although he was in favour of relieving candidates from the payment of election expenses, and of extending the time of polling at elections to such an hour that the workmen might be enabled to record their votes, without obtaining permission from their employers, he had not ventured to introduce those propositions into his Ballot Bill, lest he should thereby imperil the measure. Last year we know the Conservatives, with the aid of a few mock Liberals, did reject the clause of the Ministerial Bill for carrying into effect the first of these objects. On the other hand, whenever the Government propose a measure of an illiberal character, it passes with the utmost ease, amidst the acclamations of the reactionary benches. Some clauses of the Education Bill of 1870, and the Parks Regulation Bill of this Session, are instances of this. In like manner, when the Government, at the commencement of the French and German war, despite all their pledges of reduced expenditure, and in opposition to every true principle of Liberal policy, proposed an increase of the army, for the avowed purpose of enabling this country to take part in continual warfare, they received the almost unanimous support of a House of Commons in which the military aristocratic element so strongly predominates over the industrial.

Now, beyond all doubt, a transfer of representatives from the small boroughs and agricultural districts to the large cities and industrial counties, would weaken the oligarchy and strengthen the popular party in the House of Commons; the alteration is in itself so reasonable and so just that though those who benefit by the present disposition would do everything in their power to throw obstacles in the way of its adoption, they would hardly venture to resist it openly; not at least if it were urged forward by the representatives of the large cities, and taken up, as in that case it probably would be, by the ministry. Mr. Gladstone has, on more than one occasion, appeared to direct popular attention to this subject, and to invite a movement in its favour. When on the 27th of July, 1870, he stated the reasons that had induced him to support the ballot, he affirmed that it would not be possible permanently to maintain the county franchise on a different basis from the borough franchise; and again, last year, when deprecating a proposal made for filling up the four vacant seats through the medium of the Ballot Bill, he declared in a tone and manner that sent a shudder through the Conservative ranks that the subject of representative distribution had not been set at rest by the Act of 1867, but must ere long be reopened.

"There is," he said, "the great question of the franchise; many of us may think that that great question may advantageously receive,  
[Vol. XCVII. No. CXCL.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. XLI. No. II. I I

at an early period, further attention. There is the question of the distribution of seats, and there is also that of boundaries. These are all very large questions, and perhaps hardly any of them have been settled entirely to the satisfaction of the whole house."

In a subsequent debate,\* after explaining that he had been misunderstood if it was supposed that he had intimated that the Government were intending to make any proposals on the subject, he went on to say: "I stated the other day what I repeat now, that in my opinion the principle of the recent measure for the extension of the franchise reaches much further than the measure itself, and that the time will come when it will be carried to its legitimate conclusions." This evidently was intended to refer to the extension of household suffrage to the counties, and it was so understood by Mr. Disraeli, who, speaking immediately after him on the same occasion, said:—

"There has been one member of Parliament who from the moment he took his seat in it has taken every possible opportunity of oppressing and alarming the public mind with reference to organic changes, and that has been the Prime Minister. From the moment that Act was passed he was always ready to hint a fault and hesitate dislike. It was only last year that he told us that he thought household suffrage in the counties would be an inevitable result."

Some Liberals apprehend that a distribution of representation in proportion to population might be prejudicial to the Liberal cause, since it would augment the number of the county members. But those who are of this opinion can hardly have paid much attention to the facts of the case. With our present population of 31,465,480, and 658 representatives, there should be about one representative for 48,000 inhabitants. If this rule were applied to the eleven agricultural counties referred to above; with their population of 2,128,686, in place of eighty-five, they would have forty-four representatives, and the four industrial counties with their population of 8,279,079, in place of eighty-four would have one hundred and seventy-two. It is impossible that such a change could have any other than a beneficial effect on the party of liberal progress. This is only one illustration of the results that would be everywhere produced by an equalization of members to population. Thus Warwickshire would gain, while Sussex would lose, representatives. Scotland, too, would receive ten or twelve additional members. In other counties that experienced no change in the number of their representatives there would be a transfer from decayed and dependent villages, to thriving independent towns; in Stafford-

---

\* June 29th, 1871.

shire the members for Lichfield and Tamworth would be transferred to Dudley and Wednesbury ; and in the West Riding of Yorkshire, the members for Ripon, Knaresborough, and Pomfret would be transferred to the teeming hives of industry in and around Leeds, Bradford, and Sheffield. We are free to confess that we should indeed be surprised to learn that this had increased the strength of the oligarchy in the House of Commons.

Let one only imagine what a foreign statesman or politician, would say if our system were explained and proposed to him for adoption in his own country. If a Frenchman were advised to give four representatives to each 100,000 in Brittany and La Vendée, and one to each 100,000 in Paris, Lyons, and Marseilles, he would consider his adviser insane. What would an intelligent Italian say, if it were proposed to give fourfold the proportion of representatives to Calabria or the Abruzzo that is given to Florence, Turin, and Rome ? or what would a German say if it were suggested to him that a like advantage should be given to the inhabitants of Posen and East Prussia over those of Berlin and Cologne ? Nay, what would Englishmen say if any of the rurals or ultramontanes in the French, Italian, or German Chambers should venture upon such a proposal ? Yet this is precisely our present system, and its effects are similar in kind, if not in degree, to what they would be if adopted in those countries. Things, however, that are considered too bad for the people of any other land are deemed by some among us good enough for Englishmen, if only they have existed long enough, and we have got used to them, being as it were to the manner born. If at any time it is proposed to amend one of these manners, and to adopt in its stead one that has been approved of by our neighbours, we are at once told, what certainly is very true, that the proposed alteration is un-English ; and this by the English Philistines is held a more than sufficient ground for its rejection.

In every foreign country, without exception we believe, the principle of the assignment of representatives in equal proportion to the population of the districts represented has been adopted ; certainly this is so in Germany, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, France, Italy, and Spain. If any fixed principle is to regulate the distribution, it is difficult to see how any other standard can be adopted. It may be suggested that wealth and intelligence should be taken into consideration ; but it would be difficult, if not impossible, to find any test of intelligence, or even of wealth, that would meet with general acceptance. As regards the redistribution of representatives in England, this is of the less consequence ; for it is certain that the industrial counties, which are under-represented, exceed those that are over-represented, even more in intelligence and wealth than in the number of their inhabitants.

Take what test of intelligence you please, whether it be the percentage of the whole capable of reading, or the literary and scientific productions of the more learned, the people of Middlesex and Lancashire excel those of Dorsetshire and Wiltshire ; they also contribute infinitely more per head to the revenues of the state.

No better reason can be assigned for the existing apportionment than it is, because it is ; or it is so, because it always has been so. If indeed it were meant by this that the present disproportion has existed from the commencement of our Parliaments, the statement would be as inaccurate as the argument itself is worthless. At the time our representative system took its rise, and long afterwards, the population, and with it the energy, intelligence, and wealth of the country, was concentrated in the south and not in the north—in Devonshire and Cornwall, not in Yorkshire and Lancashire. The smallness of the number of representatives given to the counties, in comparison to the number given to the boroughs, was owing to two causes that must not be lost sight of in considering any measure of redistribution ; one was that the landed interest was held to be represented by the feudal barons, all of whom possessed seats in the Upper Chamber ; and the other was that the knights of the shires were not, like the representatives of the boroughs, chosen by all the inhabitants, but only by the freeholders, of the county. The growth of a large population beyond the limits both of the old and the new towns, who were neither tenants of the great feudatories nor yet freeholders, rendered it necessary that the suffrage should be extended to them, and that the number of the county representatives should be increased. These objects have been effected by the legislation of the last forty years ; the franchise has been extended to the 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ . rated occupiers, and the county members have been increased from eighty to one hundred and seventy-two, while the boroughs have been to that extent curtailed. If the counties now lay claim to an equal share of representation with the boroughs, it can only be sustained upon the ground that as large a portion of their population enjoys the right of electing as is the case in the boroughs. At present, owing to the difference in the franchise, a population of 100,000 in a county produces no greater number of electors than a population of 50,000 in a borough. And further, if the landed interest put forward this claim, against which we are not urging one syllable of objection, they must bear in mind that neither in justice nor by prescription, have they any right to an equal share in the Lower House as long as they retain exclusive possession of the Upper.

No question seems so well adapted to unite in one body the various conflicting sections of the Liberal party as this of the

redistribution of electoral power. The principle involved, the political equality of those to whom the constitution intrusts the exercise of the franchise, must approve itself to the reason and conscience of every man of liberal sentiments. In every large constituency, whether borough or county, the proposal to augment their number of representatives would be so popular that no political party could venture upon opposing it. As soon as a decided majority of the representatives of the great centres of population, intelligence, and wealth shall demand that those whom they represent shall no longer be considered of less importance in the State than a mere handful of their fellow-countrymen, dwelling in a few paltry villages and decayed towns, whose very names are almost unknown, except to those who grope among electoral statistics, the matter will be set at rest. A single blast of the trumpet of public opinion is all that is required to cause the walls of these Jerichos of electoral privilege to fall to the ground. Whenever a considerable body of reformers shall form a regular organization to accomplish this object, they will enter upon the conflict with the assurance of speedy success.

The various fractions of the Liberal party at the present time seem so intent upon the pursuit of their own pet schemes that they pay little regard to the success of the kindred projects urged forward by those who serve in the same camp with themselves, and belong, or ought to belong, to the same great party of liberal progress. These parties are legion, because they are many; but the legionary forces are small when they muster on the division list, in support of any special measure of Reform. We have in Parliament, and out of Parliament, advocates of unsectarian education, of the disestablishment of the Church of England, of the enfranchisement of women, of the general representation of minorities, reformers of the game-laws, of the laws of land-tenure, of the laws relating to trades' unions and the relations of master and servant; there are also the financial reformers, who advocate reduction in our once more bloated armaments. Most of these measures are supported by organizations formed for their especial furtherance, but they make little or no progress. Some of them are not brought before Parliament at all, or receive feeble support if introduced into that uncongenial atmosphere. The supporters of such reforms are generally unable to bring that amount of pressure to bear, that is requisite to force any liberal measure through a Legislature so hostile as ours is, to anything that savours of democratic innovation. Yet there is scarcely a large town whose constituency would not accept most or all of the measures above referred to, if submitted to them for their approval. Surely it would be sound and wise policy in the supporters of these measures to agree

together, and act in concert to obtain that reform without which their own special schemes must be abandoned, or relegated into the far future ; but with which it is in the highest degree probable, if not absolutely certain, that most of them would be soon adopted ; for it is manifest that the strength of real Liberalism would be increased fourfold if the progressive portions of the community, the inhabitants of the urban districts, were as well represented as the less advanced dwellers in the rural districts.

In times past the equal distribution of representation was a fundamental article in the creed both of the Chartists, and of the moderate Liberals, who upon such questions followed the lead of Mr. Hume. At the present day it presents a platform upon which reformers of every school might meet in perfect confidence that they could adopt no more efficacious mode of promoting the particular reforms they are interested in, than by rendering the House of Commons a more accurate exponent of the sentiments of the majority of the nation. Should Mr. Bright be sufficiently restored in health, to be himself again, the party would be provided with a leader eminently fitted for the post, not more by reason of his great eloquence, than of the great attention he has given to the subject.

Any plan that could hope to secure in its favour the general support of the Liberal party would require to be comprehensive without being revolutionary. We do not wish to conceal that our own opinion is that representation ought to be exactly proportioned to population. But we shall be long in reaching that goal if we wait till all are prepared to advance with us, at once, to that point. Many and great have been the reforms accomplished in England during the last forty years, but they have been in perfect harmony with the fundamental principle of our constitutional development. These reforms have been unceasing, and they have been unceasing, because they have been gradual. Some that were most modest in their inception have attained the largest proportions, while the most violent agitations have effected least. The Chartist movement, that might have accomplished so much in the interest of the English workmen, achieved absolutely nothing. It is far from probable that the people of this country will change this course of progressive reform, and adopt, either the alternative recommended by the Tories of standing still, or that suggested by the more ardent democrats, of rushing violently forward. But more than a generation has now elapsed since the great redistribution of the Reform Bill was accomplished ; this alone would seem sufficient reason for proceeding with the work then commenced, for it did not aim at completeness or perfection in its work, it attempted no more than what was required by the circumstances of the

period, and was calculated to obtain the approval of moderate men. If therefore the relative proportions of Calne and Manchester had remained unchanged till this day, if Dorsetshire and Middlesex stood in the same position to each other that they did in 1832, there would be ample reason for now reopening the question afresh. But inasmuch as the great centres of industrial activity have since then doubled their population, while the small boroughs and agricultural districts have remained stationary or have actually decreased,\* the argument in favour of so doing becomes conclusive and unanswerable. The only alteration in the distribution of members made during that period, as we have above pointed out, may be considered nugatory, if it did not aggravate the inequality that already existed between the landed and the industrial interests.

No one has seen more clearly than Mr. Bright, or striven more earnestly to impress upon his countrymen, that the question of distribution is the very centre and core of the whole subject of Reform, and that beside it the particular qualification required to confer a right to the suffrage sinks into insignificance. This was the constant burden of the speeches which he addressed to those vast assemblages which at Birmingham and elsewhere, in 1859, greeted his return to political life after an illness which on that occasion, as well as more recently, had threatened to deprive the country of his services. Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli were then in office, and he well knew the skill with which the latter, if he were permitted, would manipulate the redistribution to the advantage of the territorial interest.

To the people of Bradford, after premising that it was the general opinion of Reformers that the Bill of 1832 gave too large an influence to the counties and the landed interest, Mr. Bright said :—

“ I wish you, and I wish your countrymen everywhere, to watch this point with the keenest eye possible. Repudiate without mercy any Bill of any Government, whatever its franchise, whatever its seeming concession may be, if it does not distribute the seats which are obtained from the extinction of small boroughs mainly amongst the great city and town populations of the kingdom. The question of distribution is the very soul of the question of Reform, and unless you watch that you will be deceived ; and when the Bill is passed you may possibly turn back to lament that you are not in the position in which you now find yourselves.”

---

\* The four great industrial counties, Lancashire, Middlesex, Surrey, and the West Riding, have increased between 1831 and 1871 from 4,157,868 to 8,279,079 ; the eleven agricultural counties mentioned above have increased only from 1,739,033 to 2,128,686.



These words seem prophetic when read in the light of the Act of 1867, with its large increase of county members, and its small increase in the representation of the great towns rendered illusory by the system of minority representation ; to say nothing of the additions made to the population of many of the towns by the extension of their boundaries. Again in his speech at Rochdale, early in the following year, after referring to the necessity that existed for the adoption of the ballot, he proceeded to say :—

“I come now to a question which I was about to say is much more important than either of the others, but which has been very little discussed at public meetings ; that is, the mode in which the seats should be distributed among the constituencies. Let me tell you as I have told other assemblages, that the working men who are not now enfranchised should particularly study this point, that, although to give a man a vote may be to please his sentiment of independence and equality, and he may like to go up and poll with his richer and more free neighbour—yet as regards the legislation, and the composition of Parliament, and the action upon your Government, the giving a man a vote, or 1,000,000 of men votes, may be made of no effect, no value whatever, unless that which I call the soul and jewel of your representative system be fairly considered and equitably adjusted.”

The scheme that Mr. Bright then propounded as adequate to afford a fair representation of the people, is worthy of more consideration than it has received. It comes to us now with the further recommendation that the proposal he made at the same time for the settlement of the borough franchise was the identical one adopted nine years subsequently ; though the manner in which it became law was as little creditable as the measure itself was acceptable, to the political party through whose means, rather than by whose exertions, it was eventually passed. Mr. Bright for the first time developed his plan in a complete form at Bradford, on the 17th January, 1859 ; it was accompanied by schedules, in which the mode in which he proposed to deal with all the constituencies of England, Scotland, and Ireland, was fully and elaborately set out. He proposed that all boroughs with a population below 8000 should be entirely disfranchised. Of these there were 56 (the exact number comprised in Schedule A of the first Reform Bill, and the exact number that now have a population below 10,000). He proposed likewise that all boroughs returning two members, with a population below 16,000, should lose one ; of these there were 34. By this process 121 seats in all were to be taken from the small boroughs ; of these he proposed to add 69 to existing boroughs, and 18 to the counties ; 16 were to be given to new boroughs to be created, and the remainder to Ireland and Scotland. By the Reform Bill of 1867 and 1868, 45 seats were

taken from the small boroughs. If it is now desired merely to complete the number fixed upon by Mr. Bright for disfranchisement, it will be only necessary to take away about 80 more, and these could be obtained by making 10,000 the limit of total disfranchisement, and 20,000 the limit of semi-disfranchisement. As there are 56 in the first category, and 25 in the second, the total number would be 81, which, with Mr. Disraeli's 45, would complete the tale to 126; being five in excess of what Mr. Bright originally proposed. The population, however, has so largely increased since that date, that it may be said that ten and twenty thousand are not the proper equivalents of the eight and sixteen thousand of 1851; and that sixteen and thirty-two thousand would more correctly represent these points, and give no larger a measure of disfranchisement than what Mr. Bright would think the altered condition of the country required, to make it correspond with his original proposition. In that case 32 other towns, the largest of which is Stafford, would suffer total disfranchisement, and 11 others, with a population between 20,000 and 32,000 would lose a member. This would bring the number of seats to be gained for redistribution up to 124, three more than the number proposed to be taken by Mr. Bright's scheme. Probably the determination whether one of these, or some other similar line, should be adopted as the limit, would depend more upon considerations of expediency with regard to the passing of the measure, than to any desire to retain representatives for towns that rank in point of population between Tiverton and Stafford. Of such a plan as this, we think it may be safely affirmed, using Mr. Bright's own language, that it proposes to proceed on the same principles as the Bill of 1832, travelling a little further, exploring a little more, but not more than is required by the necessities and by the wishes of the country.

But though Mr. Bright's proposal for the disfranchisement of the small boroughs and for increasing the representation of the large towns, might meet with the approbation of the country, it does not seem likely that the same approbation would be generally extended to his mode of dealing with the moderate-sized towns and the counties. He proposed to give 6 members to four towns with a population above 316,000; 4 members to nine with a population above 127,000; 3 members to eighteen with a population above 54,000; and a second member to thirteen with a population between 54,000 and 25,000. Eight additional members were to be given to Lancashire and Yorkshire, and only 10 to all the other counties. It will hardly be deemed that 36 was an excessive addition to make to the representation of the large cities, beginning with Sheffield; but an addition of

nearly an equal number to the middle-sized towns cannot so well be defended. The increase of population has rendered indispensable some modification in the amounts selected by Mr. Bright for regulating his scheme of redistribution. We shall venture to suggest that a third member should be given to towns with a population above 100,000, a fourth to those above 200,000, a fifth to those above 300,000, and a sixth to those above 400,000. This might obtain the support of the country, and pass through a moribund House of Commons, the members of which are on the point of appearing before the judgment-seat of their constituents. But it does not seem probable that the proposal to give two and three members, to some that received them according to Mr. Bright's plan, would under any circumstance, be adopted by Parliament, constituted as it is at present; since those members could only be given to them at the expense, so to speak, of the counties, which by that plan were only to have received 18 additional representatives. If no additional members were given to towns with a population below 100,000, a considerable surplus would remain which would fall to the share of the counties. Here also it would seem desirable to act up to the precedent of 1832, which divided the members taken from the rotten boroughs in equal proportion between boroughs and counties; in that case there would be a better chance of getting the measure passed than if there were any pretence given to the county members for saying that the counties had not full justice done to them. It might, however, very properly be borne in mind, that on the occasion of Mr. Disraeli's redistribution, the portion received by the rurals, was something like a Benjamin's mess.

There is no reason, however, why the Liberal party should entertain any jealousy of the county constituencies if the suffrage were as extended in them as it is in the boroughs. The present county franchise is a 12*l.* rating, equivalent generally to a 20*l.* rental; though it was mentioned the other day, on the occasion of the West Riding election, by the special correspondent of a London journal, that he met with one case of a man paying 30*l.* rent who was only rated at 11*l.*, and consequently did not possess the necessary occupation franchise. This high rate excludes, not merely the farm-labourers, but the numerous classes of the small shopkeepers, the artisans, the miners, and the manufacturers of various sorts, who form so large a portion of the population of country towns and villages, and are scattered over even the more rural districts. Many of these are now Liberals; if the majority are not—and the same may be said of the agricultural labourers—it is merely because they have been debarred from the exercise of political power. Grant them the right of

voting in local and national elections, and thereby give them an interest in local and national concerns, and they will soon shake off that apathy which is now sometimes mistaken for Conservatism.

For different reasons, neither in Scotland, nor in Wales, nor in Ireland, could the territorial aristocracy, and the dominant Church, look for any gains, but the contrary, from an extended and free suffrage. The purely agricultural districts of England could not be more subservient to the landed and clerical interest than they are at present, they might be less so. But the urban population of England exceeds thirteen millions; the rural (which comprises also the small towns) falls short of ten millions; and, the first grows more than twice as fast as the latter. Under the influence of the railway, the telegraph, the cheap press, the cheap post, and all the other marvels of modern science, the rural districts are becoming every day more urban, and consequently more liberal. The suburban population of London amounts to a million; this is now included in the counties, and therefore deprived of household suffrage; around most of the large towns there is, in proportion to their size, an equally large and equally rapidly increasing population, similarly situated. There are fifty towns with more than ten thousand inhabitants, and an aggregate population of a million, that are not Parliamentary boroughs, and therefore do not possess the borough franchise. With these facts before us, there is no room for apprehension that under a system of equal distribution, the liberalism and intelligence of the towns should be swamped by the servility and ignorance that unhappily still exist in the country districts.

The numbers of county electors on the register in England by the latest return is 801,109. From these must be deducted a considerable number for deaths, removals, and double entries; and, a far more numerous class than all of these, the non-residents. A man may possess a vote for a county arising from a freehold, situated either in the county, or in a borough within the limits of the county, though he resides in a borough, or beyond the limits of the county entirely; one man thus may count as a dozen county voters. Sir R. Palmer, if we mistake not, once declared that he possessed the right of voting in more than a score of places; and these must have been chiefly counties, for residence or occupancy is commonly required for the exercise of the borough franchise. It is clear therefore that all these non-residents, both the borough freeholders, and the residents in other counties, must be subtracted from the number on the register, if we desire to know what proportion of the inhabitants of the counties are entitled to the suffrage. We do not imagine that any one well acquainted with the subject will deem it an extravagant calculation to assume

that from these causes the nominal list of electors must be diminished by 200,000. The population of the counties, outside the Parliamentary boroughs, is 12,048,178; if therefore the number of them possessing the franchise be 600,000, there will be only one out of twenty entitled to vote at elections; only one out of every five adult males in the enjoyment of the first and most elementary right of a citizen—a share in the government of his country, a voice in the levying of the taxes he is called upon to pay. The borough electors are 1,250,019 in number, though the borough population is only 10,655,930; this gives the franchise to one in nine of the population, for we are not required to make any considerable deduction here.

It is impossible that such a discrepancy in the first and most important of all political rights can be much longer maintained. Those essential differences which originally made a real separation between borough and county have long since been obliterated. Everything now tends to their perfect assimilation, so far as privileges and forms of government are concerned; whatever now remains of the antiquated distinctions which had their origin in the feudal system must be done away with; one and the same qualification must everywhere confer upon the citizen the right of sharing in the government of the nation, without reference to the region of the country in which he may for the time happen to reside.

It is obvious that no satisfactory distribution of representation can be effected without the equalization of the franchise. Members cannot be properly apportioned to population, and there is no other standard that can be adopted, while the same amount of population in different districts yields such different numbers of electors. It is absurd to talk about fairly settling the respective claims of boroughs and counties while some boroughs are entirely rural and some counties are entirely urban. There is manifest hardship and injustice also in taking away from towns, such as Chichester or Guildford, the right of returning a member and at the same time depriving the inhabitants of the right to possess a vote. Yet this is what takes place under the present system. If the right to the suffrage were everywhere the same, whenever a town was deprived of the privilege of returning its particular representative, the sole change would be that the inhabitants, instead of electing a member for themselves, would share in the election of members for the division of the county in which their town was situate. No injustice would be done to them by its so-called disfranchisement; on the contrary, in many instances a real and substantial benefit would be conferred upon them. For when the privilege of choosing a member to sit in the great council of the nation is bestowed upon a small

community, the animosity of party factions often assumes an intensity unknown among larger bodies; and, what is still worse, when the return of a member depends upon the wavering of a few score votes, it becomes almost impossible to exclude corrupt practices.

The supporters of the ballot believe that with secret voting it will not be possible to bribe or to intimidate particular voters, but they have never denied that it will remain possible to bribe or corrupt considerable bodies in small constituencies, or even, in some instances, the whole constituency. The secrecy of the vote will certainly weaken the voter's responsibility to his friends and neighbours and to public opinion. This may afford to men of wealth even a more favourable opportunity than they have at present for courting and for corrupting any small borough that is not absolutely dependent upon a great proprietor. In some decayed seaport, or in some depopulated country town or village, still retaining the privilege of representation, this might be easily effected by lordly magnificence and by extravagant expenditure. The gold of the millionaire would sink, not only into the pocket, but into the soul of the petty tradesmen and mechanics of such a place; and the ballot would afford no protection against its debasing influence. In the small constituencies, a man of great wealth by coming and spending his money among the inhabitants might, to use their own phrase, "do more good" for them and the place, than was ever done by the payment of guineas, after the old fashion, on the day of election. By merely taking his departure from the place he might cause the grass to grow in its streets, unless some other patron should be found to rain his golden shower upon them for a like consideration.

The adoption of the ballot, therefore, it appears to us, affords, if it were required, another and most powerful argument in favour of the disfranchisement of the small boroughs, and of a further approximation towards equal electoral districts; it makes it more than ever desirable that a law to effect this should be passed before the next general election; for secret voting, although it may diminish the chances of the rich with large constituencies, will render the petty boroughs greater objects of desire to them, and will at the same time leave the small body of their electors as much, or even more than ever, subject to the corrupting influence of the wealth possessed by those, who are often most anxious to get into Parliament because they are least fitted to be there.

---

## CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

*The Foreign Books noticed in the following sections are chiefly supplied by Messrs. WILLIAMS & NOBGE, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, and Mr. NUTT, 270, Strand.*

## THEOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY.

**D**R. COLENZO after prosecuting his researches into the Pentateuch<sup>1</sup> with an industry and perseverance worthy of all praise, has almost completed them in a sixth volume, which appears to us the most important of the series. It addresses itself to scholars rather than general readers; though the latter may easily follow its arguments and perhaps understand their force. The bishop's intellect has lost none of its vigour or lucidity, if we may judge from the bulky work before us. Rather has it acquired strength and breadth. His Hebrew learning is of a superior order, placing him on a height immeasurably above that of his opponents or detractors. He deals with the ancient documents after the fashion of a ripe German scholar; so that none can fairly deny his critical ability. The volume takes its place at once beside the most important works on the Pentateuch, and will command the attentive perusal of all who are interested in the criticism of the Hebrew Scriptures. Fortunately for the bishop's scholarly reputation, he has followed up his first part by a succession of others, each showing a development of intellectual power and critical sagacity which casts his enemies into the shade of ignorance. The chief point here investigated is the age of the Levitical legislation. In doing this, the learned author travels over a field embracing from Exodus to Joshua inclusive, carefully separating the contents of the books, and assigning them to certain dates or authors. In all cases, objections are answered and traditionary views set aside. Speaking generally, we may say that most of Leviticus, with large portions of Numbers and Exodus are attributed to the Captivity or after. The object is to bring down the priestly legislation in particular, to a late age. The bishop follows in the wake of Graf and Kuenen, who endeavour to prove the same thing. Those who will have the patience to go through the volume with a care proportionate to its importance, will be amply rewarded; for there is a richness of materials which enlarges the vision, suggests inquiry, and stimulates thought. We have not space even for a summary of the contents; but must refer to the preface for it. How far it is possible to agree with the bishop could not be explained without the discussion of numerous details unsuited to a general notice. While looking upon the goodly volume as an addition and an ornament to the best literature of the Pentateuch, commending its general spirit, recognising the masterly exegesis, the thorough acquaintance with the topics examined, and the fair tone in

<sup>1</sup> "The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined." By the Right Rev. J. W. Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal. London: Longman and Co.

which every result is enunciated, we hesitate to accept the late date of all or even the greater part of the institutions here assigned to the Babylonian captivity and after. What he terms the later legislation, receives too much of Leviticus, Exodus, and Numbers from his hands. His separating process is often microscopic and logical to a fault, subjecting documents to a modern test foreign from the genius of their times. The very ingenuity of the bishop becomes an occasional snare. The questions naturally arise, Was Ezekiel the prophet absorbed in Ezekiel the priest? Did Jeremiah and the long line of preceding prophets leave no lasting impression even on Ezra and his associates, so that they degenerated into narrow ritualists? Was Ezra himself so little imbued with the spirit of the Deuteronomist that he extended the hierarchical system, writing or revising Levitical documents which fettered the people with priestly chains more burdensome than any their fathers bore? In showing the relative ages of the Elohist and Jehovist, chiefly against Kuenen, the author is very happy. The original story, too, selected from Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy and Joshua is excellently presented. But too many insertions in other books are assigned to the Deuteronomist; nor is it at all probable that Leviticus xviii.-xx., or even xxvi. proceeded from Ezekiel. It is still more improbable that Jeremiah was the Deuteronomist. In order to make the later and Levitical legislation larger, the Elohist and Jehovistic documents are unjustly abridged. Thus Exodus viii. 5—7 is attributed to the later legislation, though it is Jehovistic; and xxxiii. 3—6 is given to the Deuteronomist, and wrongly taken from the Jehovist. The weakest and least satisfactory part of the book is the 25th chapter "on the work of Ezra and the Samaritan Pentateuch," containing several incorrect statements. Very rarely have we found the bishop's Hebrew at fault; but it is so at Exodus xxii. 28, where Elohim does not mean *the judge*, but God himself, as the word always signifies in the Pentateuch. The only part of the book which might have been conveniently omitted is appendix 125, giving an abstract of Nöldeke's first essay in his *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des A. T.* This is unnecessary for scholars, and all but useless for others. We cannot part from the volume without strongly urging it on the attention of all who wish to see how thoroughly untenable is the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Bishop Colenso has done a good work in proving this to a larger circle of readers than that which had been already convinced of it by preceding scholars. Orthodox commentators may still try to uphold the exploded idea, as is attempted in the so-called Speaker's Commentary, but they live in a circle of antiquated creeds where light is not allowed to shine. This sixth volume on the Pentateuch is a worthy monument of critical power and scholarship, which very few in England are capable of appreciating, much less of imitating with success.

Dr. Kalisch has completed his commentary on Leviticus in the style and method exemplified by the first volume.<sup>2</sup> Along with

<sup>2</sup> "A Historical and Critical Commentary on the Old Testament, with a New Translation." By M. M. Kalisch, Phil. Doc., M.A. Leviticus, part 2, chapters xi. to xxvii. London: Longman and Co.



a new version, explanatory notes, and philological remarks, he gives essays or treatises on the principal subjects touched upon in the book. The two volumes, explanatory of the most priestly portion of the Pentateuch, are valuable contributions to critical exegesis. The author possesses learning, acuteness, ingenuity. He has mastered the subjects he treats of, and discusses them with a fulness and maturity of knowledge unusual in England at the present day. Untrammelled by the shackles of tradition he moves freely, examining the old Hebrew Scriptures in the spirit of a true critic. The reader feels at every step that he is in the hands of a scholar who has a right to speak with authority, because he has thoroughly studied the documents he undertakes to explain. The results at which he has arrived in relation to the book of Leviticus are different from those of De Wette, Ewald, Knobel, Nöldeke and others. The laws there enunciated are held to be of very late origin. Believing that Leviticus proceeded from different writers at different times, he places its final revision, with that of the whole Pentateuch, about 400 B.C. When Von Bohlen published his work on Genesis in 1835, he brought down the final recension of the Pentateuch to the period of the Babylonian exile and later, which the best critics thought much too late and began forthwith to assign the seventh century before Christ as the true date. Recently, however, the old tendency to carry the book down to the Captivity and after, has reappeared, so that Graf, Kuenen, Reuss, and others unsettle the results of Ewald. In the wake of these adventurous critics, Dr. Kalisch marches after his own manner, with a boldness and ability which it is hard to resist. The scope of his book coincides to a considerable extent with that of Colenso's sixth volume just noticed. Both travel towards the same goal, largely influenced by Graf, but each in his own way and with an individuality of his own, showing that a new current has set in; or rather that Vatke's view has been resumed and stretched by a more penetrating criticism. The process followed is to trace a law of development in the chief ordinances of the Hebrews which, in Kalisch's opinion, have all passed through three stages, the physical, the historical, and the theocratic or spiritual. Accordingly, he finds in Leviticus compared with Deuteronomy a most decided progress in spiritual depth and culture, inducing a later date for the former book. Two considerations have been left in a great degree out of sight by the commentator, viz., the Elohist language of the greater part of Leviticus; and the influence which the succession of prophets must have exerted upon the national mind in checking a reliance on sacrifices and ceremonies. Were the prophetic teachings so soon forgotten as to be succeeded by a minute hierarchism greater and more burdensome than any which they had confronted? It is not easy to think so. In arguing for the late origin of the Levitical laws, the learned critic does not seem always logical or correct in his inferences. His arguments are sometimes strained. He hardly makes out his case. Had he tried to show that some parts of Leviticus, such as the 26th chapter, are late insertions, he would have commended his book to the approbation of more critics; but in

crushing every ordinance into a Captivity or post-Captivity time, he has occasionally resorted to violence. Arguing, for example, that the Day of Atonement was unknown even in Nehemiah's age, but finding it presupposed in Exodus xxx. 10, he asserts that the section xxx. 1—10 of which that verse forms a part "is acknowledged to be a very late interpolation," whereas it belongs to the fundamental Elohim-document. The author does not seem to have paid sufficient attention to the documents of which the Pentateuch is composed; for he affirms that the legend of wrestling Jacob belongs to an Elohist part of Genesis, which it does not. From the interdiction of marriage with a sister-in-law in Leviticus, but not in Deuteronomy, he infers the later origin of the former book. We should rather draw the opposite conclusion, according to the law of mental development. But to make Leviticus consistent with itself in this respect, he resorts to the conjecture that the words in Levit. xviii. 18 "to vex her in her lifetime" are a later addition, because even this verse permits marriage with a deceased wife's sister. The best part of the volume consists of the copious and exhaustive dissertations on the dietary laws of the Hebrews, on the laws of purification, on the day of atonement, on the doctrine of angels and spirits, the matrimonial laws of the Bible and their later development. Here the evidences of extensive reading are abundant, so that the references almost burden the reader. The learning is overloaded with quotations. The least satisfactory chapter is that on the New Testament in reference to the ceremonial law, which betrays marks of haste and incorrectness. When we look at the way in which Jesus spiritualized and elevated the Messianic idea, his general teaching respecting the nature of his kingdom on earth, and the ethical character of his precepts, it is certain that he intended to do away with the ceremonial law. Dr. Kalisch errs in making him a proper Jew; whereas he was a Jewish reformer who inculcated principles opposed to ceremonialism. If the cautious scholar hesitates to accept some of the arguments advanced by our author, if he discovers an undue bias towards giving all the Levitical ordinances a very recent date, and even finds incorrect explanations of Hebrew words as of "Israel," he will yet admire the great learning and critical acuteness displayed.

Dr. Newman informs us that the essays he has now reprinted were all written, except the last, while he was a member of the Established Church.<sup>3</sup> Setting aside the first two and the last, they appeared in the *British Critic*, a periodical now extinct. The topics are various, none of them purely literary except that on poetry with reference to Aristotle's Poetics; a few biographical, such as those on the author's friends, John Davison and John Keble, with the critique on the Countess of Huntingdon, in part. The volumes are ecclesiastico-theological in the main, treating of such subjects as seem peculiarly adapted to the talents and learning of the writer. His genius is well illustrated in the manipulation they receive; above all, in the point of

<sup>3</sup> "Essays, Critical and Historical." By John Henry Newman. London: Pickering.

view they are looked at, or the general issue in which they are made to converge. He writes as an Anglican clergyman of the Catholic Church, to whom that Church speaks with an authority he is bound to obey, because she is the representative of Christ on earth and possesses an inspiration rendering her infallible in all doctrines and principles necessary to salvation. The exercise of private judgment is restrained and discouraged because believers have a teacher in that church. Antiquity is revered, the old fathers extolled, and a traditional religion consisting of belief in dogmas, recommended. Reason is considered an unsafe or dangerous guide in spiritual matters; all departures from orthodoxy being stigmatized as heresy. Protestantism proper is decried; and all bodies or communions pronounced schismatical except the three branches of the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church, the Anglican, Roman, and Greek. Dr. Newman's mind is moulded by the past. It is of a narrow type, acute, logical to a certain extent, alive to nice distinctions, casuistical, ingenious, vigorous within its sphere, with a touch of quiet humour or a tinge of gentle sarcasm that adds point to his style. It lacks breadth and boldness, shrinks from innovations, has a strong mystical element allied to superstition, and cherishes a faith in the supernatural or magical, unfavourable to the growth of rational religion. One cannot but admire the transparent sincerity of the man, even when he is misled by his own subtilty. Much of his persuasiveness lies in the style, which shows a practised master of composition, graceful, insinuating, antithetic, cumulative, exemplifying great variety and compass, from the homely to the ornate. The general reasoning of the author will not bear examination. It proceeds on tacit or avowed assumptions which an Anglican or Roman Ecclesiastic may not think of questioning, however contrary to the light of reason, or repugnant to the deepest moral instincts of humanity. The tendency of Dr. Newman's essays is really to enslave the human mind by subjecting it to a vague abstraction (for it is nothing else) called the "Catholic Church;" in other words, to the pretensions of priests who lord it over conscience as presumed successors of the Apostles, endued with magical powers, the visible representatives of Christ on earth. Teaching of this sort is mischievous, the more so when it is conveyed in insinuating diction wearing the garb of spirituality, and quietly enunciating tenets said to be held by the Church for eighteen hundred years. Yet the essays are interspersed with just remarks. The introductions in particular often contain good sentiments excellently expressed. How admirably the author is fitted for theological controversy may be seen in the paper on the Protestant idea of Antichrist, one of the best and most conclusive in the volume, though as usual he throws no light on what Antichrist is, but erroneously identifies it with a future person. It is curious to observe how poor an interpreter of Scripture Dr. Newman proves when he attempts exegesis. This is specially so in his quotations from Isaiah. He is also totally ignorant of those recent discussions of the New Testament books which have resulted in the rejection of the authenticity of many. The pastoral epistles are cited as Paul's; the three Epistles of John as his really; and so of

the fourth gospel. Probably the most interesting paper to general readers will be that on the Countess of Huntingdon. Those on Davison and Keble are laboured. The second, on Rationalism in religion, chiefly against Erskine and Jacob Abbott, is valueless. That on Lamennais is unimportant. The most learned essay, that on Ignatius and his theology, is far behind the present state of criticism, the able researches of Baur, Lipsius, and Hilgenfeld being ignored; while it is vainly attempted to uphold the seven Greek epistles by means of the old arguments. The thirteenth essay, on "Private Judgment," is ingenious, but altogether erroneous; and we can hardly acquit the writer of unfairness in suppressing the passage, 1 Cor. x. 15, though he quotes many others to the same effect, artfully trying to show that when an appeal is made to private judgment, it is done to settle who the teacher is; that is, the Church, in his opinion. Such assertions are absurd. The most elaborate essay is on the Catholicity of the Anglican Church, where great effort is made to uphold an erroneous tenet, the writer not going to the root of the matter, otherwise his theory would dissolve into air. Several notes are added to the dissertations to correct, modify, or supplement what Dr. Newman as a Romanist now supposes necessary. He has little, however, to retract. With slight exceptions the views inculcated by the former member of the Established Church agree with his present ones. From Oriel College to St. Mary's, Oscott, was an easy transition. The volumes are the expression of a man out of harmony with an age of advanced culture and liberal religion, living in the dim twilight of the past, and vainly striving to shut out the genial air lest it blow the dust of ages from the chamber of superstition in which he dwells as though it were the gate of heaven.

The replies of Nikon, translated from the Russian by Mr. Palmer,<sup>4</sup> may be regarded as a part of the history of the Russian Church and Hierarchy, though they concern the life of a single individual. That individual, however, was a prominent actor in the affairs of the Eastern Orthodox Church, during the seventeenth century. Nikon became patriarch of Russia in 1652, through the favour of the Czar Alexis who at first placed unbounded confidence in the active ecclesiastic, but afterwards changed his mind. The patriarch, perceiving the change, removed from Moscow, in 1658, to a neighbouring monastery built by himself, whence he sent forth solemn anathemas against his enemies. Subsequently re-appearing in Moscow, in open opposition to the Czar, the latter summoned a council there, which deposed and banished Nikon. Having been liberated, at length, by the request of the young Czar Theodore, he died on his return to the Voskresenk monastery, A.D. 1681. The book consists of the replies of Nikon to the questions of the Boyar Simeon Streshneff, addressed to Paisius Ligarides, with the answers of the latter. These questions and answers are thirty in

<sup>4</sup> "The Patriarch and the Tsar. The Replies of the Humble Nikon, by the Mercy of God Patriarch, against the Questions of the Boyar Simeon Streshneff, and the Answers of the Metropolitan of Gaza, Paisius Ligarides." Translated from the Russ by W. Palmer, M.A. London: Trübner and Co.

number. The accused patriarch's replies are lengthy, full of appeals to canons and citations from the Fathers, interspersed with Scripture passages. The translator of the book looks upon Nikon as a champion of ecclesiastical rights, like Thomas à Becket in England, or Gregory VII., or Alexander III. in Christendom. The patriarch was a bold, restless, ambitious, unbending ecclesiastic, who stood up for the Church's independence of the secular power in Russia, or rather for the Church's supremacy over that power, and failed. Such as have the courage to peruse the large book, will find enough in it to show them the real temper of an overbearing ecclesiastic, the arguments he used against his accusers, and the excommunications he thought fit to utter against the Czar himself, when the latter refused to comply with arrogant demands. Mr. Palmer's standpoint is very much that of Nikon. He considers a state-supremacy in religion as anti-christian; and the supremacy of a spiritual head, which is identical with spiritual despotism, as the right ordinance.

"The Divine Kingdom on Earth as it is in Heaven," is the title of a curious book intended apparently to give a wider aspect of revealed truth than the usual one.<sup>5</sup> The author proposes to point out the principles and substance of "the Revelation which God has given through his Son, and which is conveyed by the Church in her Scriptures and her Ordinances." In pursuance of this design, he describes the nature of the divine order with its final purposes, human apostacy, the restoring dispensation, its laws and development, the manifestation of the divine order in Christ, and the future progress and fulfilment of the restoring dispensation. Thus the volume is a body of divinity, after the fashion of Boston's "Fourfold State;" though conceived and carried out in a different manner. The orthodox author adds nothing to what has been often said; but writes in a general, vague, half-philosophical method, equally unsatisfactory and obscure. His endeavour to resolve everything here to a divine plan, and to find supernatural purposes in man's life on earth, while he keeps steadily in view the Bible, the Church, and the Fathers, issues in a volume of misty musings, proceeding from an earnest mind toiling to body them forth as the interpretation of a divine revelation. The outline, as he calls it, of the main facts brought to man's view by Christ revealing them in the Bible, is a delusive one because based on an assumption, viz. the trustworthiness of "the Revelation organs." Till the books of Scripture are properly apprehended, surveys of man's history and destiny derived from them are deceptive. The author of "the Divine Kingdom on Earth" misconceives the origin, and mistakes the nature of those books.

The author of the work entitled "The Dogma,"<sup>6</sup> dissatisfied with the main dogma of the Church of England respecting the inspiration of Scripture, gives his reasons for denying it, drawn from an attentive perusal of the records themselves. Finding errors, contradictions, legends, and absurdities in the Bible, he adopts and uses it

<sup>5</sup> "The Divine Kingdom on Earth as it is in Heaven." London: H. S. King.

<sup>6</sup> "The Dogma; or, What is Faith?" By Ezion. London: Trübner and Co.

only so far as it excites and fosters devotional feelings, or gives just views of the Almighty Creator. Accordingly he rejects most of the doctrines to which the orthodox attach primary importance. The work displays ability and acuteness. The results embodied in it are the workings of a clear understanding, vigorous, independent, and fearless. The writer advances little that is new; but it is clearly his own. An intelligent layman apparently, he has not read much on the subjects discussed. The title of the book is not a good one, and the contents are badly arranged. The style is also loose and careless, as though it proceeded from one unused to composition. Amid obvious marks of haste there are not a few mistakes; and the reasoning is often feeble. The writer is not fortunate in the choice of books used on the orthodox side; nor is he acquainted with those of an opposite kind, which would have prevented him from making crude assertions. Thus Tischendorf, who is not a Swede but a German, should not have been quoted about the origin of the four gospels: and Dr. Cumming should have been left in the hands of the London Zulu. Most of the volume is occupied with a survey of the Old Testament history, from the Creation to the birth of Christ. Had the author consulted a good Introduction to the Old Testament, and a similar one to the New, he would have made his volume much better, and less vulnerable. We accept it as the outcome of one who uses his reason with courage and consistency in examining records which the Church claims to be divine by an untenable assumption.

Mr. Hammond's little book<sup>7</sup> is an uncritical compilation, the work apparently of a beginner. He relies on a few favourite authors, such as Mr. Scrivener, Dr. Tregelles, Prof. Westcott. Even Dean Alford and Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible" serve him as sources of information. Had he extended his sphere of vision he might have gone to the last edition of Kitto's Cyclopædia with advantage, not to speak of Davidson's Treatise on Biblical Criticism. It is evident that his judgment is not commensurate with his diligence, else he would not have made the mistakes that meet the eye of the scholar. In some places he betrays ignorance of what has been written on the topics he speaks of; in others he blunders by not consulting the originals themselves, but following his ordinary authors. The value of such a manual depends on its accuracy; and it is therefore a pity that the compiler is not more accurate. In speaking of the Gothic version, he is unaware of the recent and most copious account of it given in Kitto's Cyclopædia, contented to quote his two favourites, who had not the means of examining Uppström's accurate collations. The Jerusalem-Syriac version was first published in 1861-1864 by Count Minischaleci Erizzo; but Mr. H. seems not to have seen the edition, and quotes the very improbable opinion that the version was made from a Greek evangelistarium. The second edition of Hug's "Einleitung" is said to have been published in 1826, but the preface of it is dated 1820, while the fourth appeared in 1847. And where does Lachmann speak of the

---

<sup>7</sup> "Outlines of Textual Criticism applied to the New Testament." By C. E. Hammond, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

two groups of MS. readings, African and *Byzantine*? Mark xvi. 9–20 is said to be *canonical* and *inspired*, but not *authentic*—an absurd distinction. In discussing the received reading of Matthew i. 18, which should not be disturbed by the omission of *Jesus*, it is stated that all the evidence for that of *Christ* only is of the second century; but the Vulgate is later. Were the manual corrected and supplemented, the compiler's reading widened, his judgment less dependent on inferior critics, his University spectacles laid aside for larger ones, it might become a more scholarly performance.

Dr. Dollinger's "Fables respecting the Popes"<sup>8</sup> is a work worthy of the reputation which that veteran ecclesiastic has obtained. Evincing sound historical criticism, the interest of the reader is awakened and maintained throughout. The tone is calm, the learning thorough and extensive, the reasoning careful and conclusive. The work is a very valuable contribution to ecclesiastical history, for which students and scholars will be grateful. The longest essays in the volume are those on Pope Joan and the Donation of Constantine, both exhaustive of the respective subjects. Others are on the mythical Pope Cyriacus, the abdication of Marcellinus, Constantine's reputed baptism by Sylvester, Tiberius and Felix, Anastasius II. and Honorius I., Gregory II. heading a revolt against Leo III., and the defamation of Sylvester II.'s memory. Dollinger conducts his discussions in the true spirit of a philosophical historian, tracing the origin, time, and causes of the myths, their gradual development, and ultimate exposure. The general result tends to lower the Popes and their advocates. Fabrications in the interest of an ambitious hierarchy must lessen it in the eyes of truth-loving men. Rome was a manufactory of such forgeries, whose object was to uphold and extend arrogant claims. The translation is well executed by Mr. Plummer, who has prefixed a good introduction, appended notes, and added several pertinent papers to the end of the volume. The author has been fortunate in finding a competent and well-instructed translator. In one place, however, he has incautiously committed himself to the opinion that St. Peter was at Rome; quoting highly objectionable words from Canon Robertson, and inserting a note which is one-sided because the critics who have advocated Peter's non-residence in the capital of Italy are ignored. It is impossible to show that St. Peter was ever at Rome; all circumstances tend to the opposite conclusion. After the fundamental investigations of Lipsius in his "Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe," and still more in his "Die Quellen der römischen Petrusgeschichte," it is impossible for a critic to hold the usual Roman Catholic opinion.

Mr. Scudamore has compiled an elaborate and full account<sup>9</sup> of all particulars relating to the nature and administration of the Lord's

<sup>8</sup> "Fables respecting the Popes of the Middle Ages. A Contribution to Ecclesiastical History." By John J. Ign. von Dollinger. Translated, with Introduction and Appendices, by A. Plummer. London: Rivingtons.

<sup>9</sup> "Notitia Eucharistica; a Commentary Explanatory, Doctrinal, and Historical, on the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion, according to the use of the Church of England, &c." By W. E. Scudamore, M.A. London: Rivingtons.

Supper as it is administered in the Church of England, comparing the various revisions through which the Book of Common Prayer passed with other ancient liturgies, and giving copious extracts from the Fathers as well as Anglican divines. From his point of view, and with his object, the book will be of great use to all ministers of the Established Church for its collected minute information respecting particulars more or less important in their apprehension. It is a storehouse of facts, opinions, and comments connected with the administration of a rite to which the majority of Christians attach peculiar efficacy. The labour and learning expended on the topic excite the admiration of readers less conversant with the history of the last supper. The work is divided into two parts, each subdivided into numerous chapters with their sections. In all that relates to the original institution of the Sacrament, with the passages of the New Testament that speak of it, and in the references to the Apostolic Fathers, with certain apocryphal productions such as the "Recognitions of Clement," the author cannot be relied on, as he has not examined with a critical eye the writings of the New Testament, nor made himself acquainted with the results arrived at by modern scholars relative to the earliest literature of Christianity. Accordingly, the reader will meet with many childish interpretations, unfounded assumptions, and trifling remarks. Thus he says that the first Christians at Jerusalem "assembled in the oratories at the top of their houses, to break the bread of the Holy Eucharist," (Acts ii. 42); and in another place, "the gospel should be read by a priest in preference to a deacon, and by the celebrant in preference to another priest when only two are present." The reader will also find a strong element of the mystical and unintelligible in discussions about the body and blood of Christ present in the Eucharist. The author looks at things from a High Church standpoint, which is generally *dictated by faith* not by reason.

Dr. Lee, disagreeing with the opinion of the Archbishop of Canterbury, that the Church of England does not sanction or authorize prayer for the dead,<sup>10</sup> undertakes to show that it is a Christian duty, a scriptural doctrine, an apostolic practice sanctioned by the early and mediæval church, incorporated in early and later liturgies, and held by many divines of the Church of England. Attaching great importance to the practice, he strives to set forth its efficacy in various forms, and with diversified arguments. Like theologians generally, who profess to know more of the unseen world, of heaven, hell, intermediate states, the souls of departed good and evil men, he discourses copiously and confidently about these matters. The first half of the volume consists of twelve chapters, the second half of appendices, in which several curious things appear. The author has been a diligent student, gathering together a body of details relative to his subject which may be useful to subsequent writers. He has not succeeded, however, in proving that the Church of England as such, authorizes prayer for the dead; but is obliged to admit that the Communion Service and that for the

<sup>10</sup> "The Christian Doctrine of Prayer for the Departed." By the Rev. F. G. Lee, D.C.L. &c. London: Strahan and Co.



burial of the dead in the present Book of Common Prayer are less definite in their prayers relating to the departed than those which were used before. All that the volume shows is, that many early and mediæval writers, including liturgies of the Greek, Roman, and other churches expressed the doctrine of prayer for the dead. Several bishops and others in the Church of England have also held it; as their words prove. It is a harmless tenet, the offspring of natural affection and Christian feeling. That is all. The parts respecting the belief of the Jews as evidenced by their canonical writings, and that of the first Christian authors as shown in the New Testament, are largely interspersed with misinterpretations. The well-known passage in Job, and others in Ecclesiastes are misapprehended. The Jews did not believe in future immortality, much less in the resurrection of the body, till a very late period. The author equally misinterprets Matthew v. 25-26, the parable of Lazarus, Luke xxiii. 43, and places in the epistle to the Hebrews which he falsely ascribes to Pauline authorship. Dr. Lee's ignorance of the Bible is great, his reasoning power small. His style, too, is loose and rhetorical. He writes more like a partisan than a scholar; and occasionally betrays a spirit of narrow vehemence unbecoming the gospel. Certain of the Reformers are characterized as "pedantic, gloomy, narrow-minded, meddling." "The extravagance and fanaticism of the democratic gossellers of Queen Elizabeth's reign" are spoken of. The tendency of the book may be judged of by the encomium on Laud, "the saviour and restorer of the English Church, without whom, and the ecclesiastical school he formed, it would in all probability have become a mere Protestant sect." Dr. Lee may be a sincere ecclesiastic; he is neither a good divine nor an enlightened reasoner. Presuming to tell the reader many things about the dead, their preparatory state for heaven, their purification, their need of our prayers, their souls "in the hands of God," but "not in His presence," as he affirms, he indulges in conjectures, which, though hazarded by many good men before, are the offspring of imagination.

The Anglo-Saxon version of the Gospels was probably made in the eighth century.<sup>11</sup> Several MSS. of it have been preserved, none, however, exhibiting its original purity. It has been printed four times, by Archbishop Parker, Dr. Marshall, Mr. Thorpe, and Dr. Bosworth. In 1858 Mr. Kemble edited the Gospel according to Matthew on a new and exhaustive plan, of which the portion now published by Mr. Skeat forms the second instalment. After the method of Kemble, the left-hand page contains two columns, the first having the text of the Corpus Christi College MS., the second that of the Hatton MS. Beneath these are the various readings of other codices. The right-hand page exhibits the Lindisfarne MS. with its Latin text and interlinear Northumbrian gloss beneath, with the gloss alone of the Rushworth MS. The volume is admirably edited by a thoroughly compe-

<sup>11</sup> "The Gospel according to St. Mark, in Anglo-Saxon and Northumbrian Versions Synoptically Arranged. With Collations exhibiting all the Readings of all the MSS." By the Rev. W. W. Skeat, M.A. Cambridge. At the University Press.

tent scholar, who has increased its value by an excellent description of all the MSS. and printed editions, a collation of the Latin texts of the Lindisfarne and Rushworth MSS. as also critical notes. We trust that the remaining Gospels will be published on the same plan by Mr. Skeat, in order to complete the work. The instalment he has given is a most valuable one.

The Psalms of Solomon, to which the attention of scholars has been directed in recent times by Movers, Ewald, Dillmann, Grimm, Langen, and Hilgenfeld, have been carefully edited by Dr. Geiger with a German translation, critical notes, and explanations.<sup>12</sup> This work is more thorough than that of Hilgenfeld, and enters into the various questions respecting the apocryphal book at greater length; so that it becomes indispensable to the critic. The Psalter of Solomon proceeded from a pious Jew and was written in Hebrew, of which the existing Greek is a translation. It is difficult to determine its date. Ewald supposes it belongs to the Maccabean period; Geiger contends that it originated in the time of Pompey; and others bring it down still later, to the age of Herod. It is evident that the Jews were sorely harassed by heathen enemies at the time; and that Jerusalem with its temple was desecrated. The volume is a valuable contribution to the literature of the subject, though it is scarcely satisfactory on some points. Though the author's critical ability is not very conspicuous, his industry deserves praise.

The work of Herr Haupt on the citations from the Old Testament in the Gospels, examines first, the Old Testament in the mouth of Jesus; secondly, in the mouth of the Evangelists.<sup>13</sup> It contains a full and minute examination of every citation occurring in the evangelists. The results he arrives at are, that Jesus never allegorized the Old Testament, nor attributed to it a sense contrary to its proper meaning; but that he interpreted it according to his own higher insight, using occasionally the historical sense as a starting-point to which he might attach another more spiritual and correct one. His profound comprehension of the spirit dominating the Old Testament was the principle that regulated the use he made of it in his teaching. As to the Evangelists, Haupt finds a difference of method between their quotations and that of Jesus, leading to a difference of results. They show the fulfilment of prophecy; and the exegesis of their citations in doing so often contains a higher meaning than they were conscious of themselves. Herr Haupt has failed to point out a principle or law pervading all citations; and has contributed nothing to the elucidation of the subject. The quotations of the New Testament are made according to the prevailing Jewish method, so that typical and allegorical senses are either substituted for the true historical one, or superadded to it. The various writers followed no spiritual law that could legitimately override the plain meaning of the Old Testament. They allegorized freely, interpreting passages with a

<sup>12</sup> "Der Psalter Salomo's." Herausgegeben und erklärt von P. Ed. Ephr. Geiger. Augsburg. 1871.

<sup>13</sup> "Die alttestamentlichen Citate in den vier Evangelien." Erörtert von Erich Haupt. London: Williams and Norgate.

definite object. The collection of places cited in the Gospels is full and accurate; but the discussions on each are often forced or incorrect. Herr Haupt's labour has been all but lost.

The anonymous author of "*Ecce Episcopus*"<sup>14</sup> asserts that the Church is theocratic, Christ alone being the head; that all its members are baptized by the Head with the Holy Ghost; and that water baptism, with the Lord's Supper, was merely temporary. The continuance of these sacraments has led to all the ritualism of the Church. The chapters are very short, and appear to have no natural sequence. A list of addenda consists of others "written simultaneously" and irrelevant to the chief subject. The book is a collection of feeble, commonplace sentiments, sometimes right, often wrong. The author does not understand the New Testament writings in their origin, authorship, tendencies; and dogmatizes in his own way about their contents. He decries the exercise of reason, and applies the usual language of the orthodox to liberal theologians. The book is of no value.

Dr. Graetz has followed up his Commentary on Ecclesiastes by one on the Song of Solomon, which bears the same characteristic stamp.<sup>15</sup> The Introduction, containing more than half the book, discusses all points of importance connected with it, the state of its exegesis, the poetical form in which it is cast, its leading tendency, its date, method of interpretation, condition of the text, and the history of its interpretation. He maintains the unity of the poem, argues against its being a drama or idyll, and maintains that it is an epic love poem throughout, in which the Shulamite tells of her love to the daughters of Jerusalem. He upholds its didactic tendency, dates it in the Macedonian period between 230-218 B.C., and points out many corruptions, transpositions and disfigurements in the text. The discussions show acuteness, learning, and ingenuity. The author evinces great independence and originality. But he is bold and rash. In several respects he has not succeeded. The dramatic form of the work cannot well be denied; nor can the dialogues form part of the Shulamite's narrative to the mute daughters of Jerusalem. The supposed corruptions are for the most part violent conjectures. Perhaps the ablest section is that on the date, in which numerous particulars, including linguistic peculiarities, are adduced with great skill. But there is grave reason for doubting the alleged late date. On the whole, we hesitate to assent to the majority of the author's novel positions. The Introduction is followed by the original text and a German version, with a commentary beneath. The whole is a contribution to the literature of the Old Testament, worthy of attention as the production of an ingenious scholar. Had it manifested less evidence of a straining after novelty, it would have gained in excellence.

One of Swedenborg's disciples has given, from the original Latin, a treatise on the White Horse of Revelation xix., and a summary

<sup>14</sup> "*Ecce Episcopus, the Bishop of Souls and his Church.*" London: Longmans.

<sup>15</sup> "*Sohir Ha-Schirim, oder das Salomonische Hohelied.*" Uebersetzt und kritisch erläutert von Dr. H. Graetz. London: D. Nutt.

from the "*Arcana Cœlestia*" about the Word.<sup>16</sup> The white horse is said to signify "the understanding of the Word as to its spiritual or internal sense." This system of interpreting Scripture is radically incorrect by setting forth more senses than one. The literal, historical, grammatical sense is the true and only one. That called the internal, which is supposed to contain mysteries, is fictitious.

Mr. Dobney need not have published his tract, but contented himself with circulating it among his own hearers.<sup>17</sup> It speaks of Churches, especially Nonconformist ones, of baptism, the basis of fellowship, and such matters. The author has emancipated himself from some of the narrow dogmas of his sect; and writes with freedom respecting a few points which his brethren usually think it dangerous to discuss. The ideas, however, are of the ordinary type, and the style is somewhat loose. Into the genius of the New Testament the respected writer does not see far.

The little book ambiguously styled "*The Rationale of Christianity*,"<sup>18</sup> consists of a single chapter, and is a feeble attempt to summarize the contents of the Old and New Testaments, according to orthodoxy and the letter. The author, who is by no means an exact writer, repeats platitudes, and suggests a few things about Churches which are impracticable. One who blunders in the meaning of Genesis i. 1, 2, who sets forth old commonplaces about the inspiration of the canonical, and the non-inspiration of the apocryphal books, and talks of God "betraying an anxious care in creation," is unfit to discuss the *Rationale of Christianity*, not knowing what Christianity essentially is and professes to do.

We can only give a word of commendation to Mr. Logan's book, now in its seventh edition.<sup>19</sup> The copious extracts in prose and poetry will be welcome to many. Among the latter are some beautiful pieces which touch the best emotions of our nature; and though the former might be weeded with advantage, it is pleasant to find so many Calvinists in favour of infant salvation; contrary to Boston's "*Fourfold State*," and apparently to the Westminster Confession of Faith. The spirit and tendency of the volume deserve universal approval.

Two volumes of "*Boston Lectures on Christianity and Scepticism*"<sup>20</sup> appear under the auspices of the Congregational Churches of Massachusetts, written by men pledged to orthodox creeds, by preachers or teachers paid for holding the creeds in question. They do not proceed

<sup>16</sup> "On the White Horse mentioned in the Apocalypse, chap. xix., with a Summary of the *Arcana Cœlestia* on the Subject of the Word, and its Spiritual or Internal Sense." From the Latin of Emanuel Swedenborg. London: Published by the Swedenborg Society.

<sup>17</sup> "Free Churches; a Tract for my own Congregation." By the Rev. H. H. Dobney. London: Strahan and Co.

<sup>18</sup> "*The Rationale of Christianity*." London: Longman and Co.

<sup>19</sup> "*Words of Comfort for Bereaved Parents*." Edited by W. Logan. London: James Nisbet and Co.

<sup>20</sup> "*Boston Lectures, 1870. Christianity and Scepticism; comprising a Treatment of Questions in Philosophical Criticism*."

"*Boston Lectures, 1871. Christianity and Scepticism; comprising a Treatment of Questions in Biblical Criticism*." London: Hodder and Stoughton.

from learned philosophers or scientific laymen, else they might probably be of a different character. Each volume contains ten lectures, and the subjects are diversified. The first exhibits evidences of higher intellectual ability than the second. Indeed the latter consists, for the most part, of sermons, or what would commonly pass for such. To characterize separately each lecture of the work would occupy more space than it is desirable to give. A few reflections suggested by their perusal are all that need be stated. Scepticism, embracing in the view of these lecturers all important deviations from orthodoxy, has little to fear from them. Nothing new or weighty is advanced to make orthodoxy more acceptable to the thoughtful or the scientific; nor is any satisfactory refutation of scepticism offered. The volumes rest on the assumed or traditional beliefs which have reigned so long over the Catholic church. The writers start with the usual tenets of orthodoxy, and assail whatever clashes with their truth. It would have contributed to the real discussion of the questions had they clearly defined what they mean by a *Revelation*; and shown how that very Revelation could be communicated to the human mind in harmony with its free action and finite nature. In like manner, when they argue against Comte's and other philosophies, they should have enunciated their own. The lectures present afresh arguments and statements which have been frequently refuted. They repeat what have been disposed of to the satisfaction of competent and impartial scholars. What surprises us most is the quiet enunciation of ideas wholly incorrect; the bold advancement of unfounded propositions. There is also a vague generality about the lectures, as well as a preaching character, which preclude clear and precise statement. In point of composition and style they are inferior productions, though the attempt at smart writing and oratorical finery is patent. Bad taste and vulgar expressions disfigure many parts. Occasionally, severe language is applied to sceptics. The authors are seldom masters of their subjects, but write like persons who had got them up in haste. Hence a want of adequate learning and necessary information peeps out. It is needless to state that the subject of miracles, often touched upon in the volumes, receives no light. As to prophecy, it is commonly misapprehended, and therefore most erroneous assertions are made about it. Nor is there any attempt to show what the Christianity of Jesus is, as gathered from his authentic sayings in the gospels; on the contrary, the fourth gospel is freely used for his sayings. Pauline Christianity, too, is neither fully nor precisely stated. A few sentences will give an idea of these volumes. "The Bible records certain events which *demand*ed, *beyond dispute*, God's special interposition." "I find in the Bible really but one thought—a thought indeed of incomparable grandeur and of innumerable relations, but which, itself, is as single as it is sublime." "Comte was an avowed Atheist!" "Schleiermacher wore his heart on his sleeve, and allowed men to see it." Not so. "The Scriptures are the *authentic and perfect utterances* of an already existing faith." Of the usual collection of Pauline writings it is said, "No critic doubts that they were written by him!"

"It is an instinct of the race to desire an infallible objective revelation, and to believe that such a one has been made." "That a revelation had been made to the early ancestors of the Jews is rendered probable by *the pure and rigid monotheism* which always characterized them." "Moses takes up the cudgels for the maidens at the well against the unmannerly shepherds." "Do such critics (as Colenso) most resemble moles blindly burrowing in the earth, or owls that see nothing in the light of day, but prowling about for their prey in the night? or are they most like vultures whose delight is to feed on dead carcasses, but they care not if they tear the living flesh in their search for carrion?" "Besides the grand, continuous, *olamitic* strain of yesterday, to-day, and for ever, ever and anon thundering in the hallelujah-chorus of Messianic prophecy, the Hebrew prophets always had a particular mission for their own age." It is impossible not to see that the lecturers write in ignorance of the true meaning and development of the Biblical books, their authenticity, dates, contents; that they ignore the latest and best results of criticism, and utter with great self-complacency what cannot bear a moment's analysis. When one says that the general consent of modern criticism ascribes the ninetyeth Psalm to Moses, quoting Ewald and Hitzig (who hold the reverse); another thinks Delitzsch, a Jew, who proves that the same man penned all parts of Isaiah's book; and another asserts that recent discoveries furnish *indubitable evidence* that the gospels had acquired similar authority to the Old Testament as early as A.D. 130, the scholar can smile at such crass ignorance. It is a settled result of criticism, that all the gospels, as we now have them, appeared in the second century. The two volumes might be compressed with advantage into one, by omitting the worthless lectures. Had the first, fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth of the first volume; with the introductory discourse, the first, second, third, fifth, sixth, eighth, and tenth Lectures of the second volume been prudently withheld, the cause advocated would have assumed a more respectable shape. But the authors are generally below their subjects, and stand on a slippery basis. To exclude myth and legend from the Bible; to maintain the infallible inspiration of its essential contents; to uphold their unity of plan and purpose, and other related positions, is impossible at the present day. The disintegration of orthodoxy is an accomplished fact; and so far from criticism confirming the authenticity of the gospels, as is here asserted with unblushing confidence, it has effectually disproved it.

Dr. Melia has written a little book having for its object the refutation of some recent opinions about man's origin and nature, with the proof of harmony between modern discoveries in natural science and revelation.<sup>21</sup> Having read a good many books, especially Latin and French in addition to English ones, he adduces pertinent quotations, and makes remarks upon them; but his general style of reasoning is deficient in force. His conclusions are so rapid as to wear the

<sup>21</sup> "Hints and Facts on the Origin of Man, and of his Intellectual Faculties." By Pius Melia, D.D. London: Longmans and Co.

appearance of mere opinions stated in an off-hand style. In arguing that mankind descended from one pair, and that the soul is spiritual as well as immortal, he writes sensibly; but agreement between natural science and the Bible has still to be proved. In all that relates to the Pentateuch and its interpretation, he is ignorantly dogmatic, repeating the antiquated idea of Moses writing the book of Genesis, and assuming the whole to be literal history. In like manner, he tries in vain to show that the original state of man was an uncivilized one, or that he has not lived for countless ages on the earth. Even his seventh chapter, where the views are somewhat more liberal than ordinary, is marred by exaggeration; for it is impossible to prove that the first development of speech and reason is due to social teaching *simply* and *solely*. That it is due to such teaching *in part*, most will admit.

Dr. Priestley's "History of the Corruptions of Christianity,"<sup>22</sup> first published in 1782, has been reprinted from Rutt's edition, with a new preface, and a new appendix taken from the letters addressed to Bishop Horsley, and from the work entitled "An History of the Early Opinions Concerning Jesus Christ." The book is one-sided from its very nature, and has been almost superseded by later ones. Dr. Priestley aimed at showing that the early Christians believed Jesus Christ to be but a mere man; for which purpose he gives extracts embodying the opinions of many writers. The scheme of the work is extensive and its plan well laid out. As a contribution to church history it has its value. But it is not comprehensive enough to give all sides of the question; and fails to prove the trinitarianism of the Catholic Church up to the Nicene Council, or even to Justin Martyr. The pre-existence of Jesus, as well as his deity, were held much sooner than the learned writer supposes; for they appear in some of the New Testament writings. The volume may be supplemented and corrected in part by Burton's Testimonies of the Anti-Nicene Fathers, a book, however, which gives merely the opposite phase of the subject, and is therefore equally one-sided. Recent works on Dogmengeschichte, especially that of Baur; and the learned work of Dorner on the Person of Christ, present the whole subject in its true view; and were Priestley now living, he would treat the question in a very different and more satisfactory way. The book might have been improved by notes; but it can hardly be made to reflect the state of our present knowledge on the whole subject.

Mr. Oxenham describes in excellent English the acts of the Passion Play, which he and many others witnessed in the autumn of last year.<sup>23</sup> Every part of the ceremonial seems to have affected him; and the whole to have deepened his devotional feeling. Roman Catholics of course speak of the scenes with reverence and awe; though many others think that they foster supersti-

---

<sup>22</sup> "A History of the Corruptions of Christianity." By Joseph Priestley, LL.D., &c. London: The British and Foreign Unitarian Association.

<sup>23</sup> "Recollections of Ober-Ammergau in 1871." By H. N. Oxenham, M.A. London: Rivingtons.

tion. Parts of the gospels are distorted by it; current misrepresentations in the story of Jesus's life, perpetuated. The writer hopes that the influence of the *Passionspiel* may help to counteract the scepticism of the day, which would fain build up for itself out of the moral teachings of the gospel an undogmatic Christianity; but the disintegration of orthodoxy cannot be checked by a form of religion which appeals to the senses alone. From the fact of the "Recollections" having appeared in the *Guardian* newspaper, we infer that High Church Orthodoxy does not scruple to receive help from Romanists, but rather sympathizes with the latter to a certain extent, hoping to restrain free thought in matters religious. The sensuousness of the Sacred Play will create aversion in thoughtful minds to the communions that sanction or applaud such gross methods of inculcating truth or intensifying devotion. The author writes like a Romanist prepared to hold by the teachings of his church. We need scarcely say that narrow sentiments occasionally occur in his essay; or that he evinces ignorance of the gospel story as understood by the best critics.

Mr. Scott of Ramsgate has been employed for many years in publishing pamphlets and papers promoting free thought in religious matters.<sup>24</sup> The number and variety of his tracts are very considerable. Writers, clerical and lay, aid him with their pens. Beneficed and unbeneficed clergymen, the late Bishop Hinds himself, gentlemen of fortune, members of parliament, physicians and others, co-operate. What may be the effect, it is impossible to calculate; but such expenditure of talent, time, and money must be beneficial on the whole. Mr. Scott seems to publish without a systematic plan, and some of his pamphlets possess little value. He should refrain from circulating what is weak, thin, wordy, trifling, even though it be printed at the expense of the authors. His list, however, includes tracts of sterling value; well-reasoned and excellently-written essays on topics worthy of discussion. Among his latest issues we notice two parts of a catechism written by a physician, evincing more than ordinary power of thought and reasoning. The writer is familiar with the works of Spinoza, Strauss, Lessing, and other advanced thinkers. A philosopher and theologian, he reflects on the deepest problems of existence, condensing the substance of volumes into the small compass of ninety pages. Here the reader will find the nature of religion unfolded; the Hebrew Scriptures briefly characterized by the light of reason; the existence and attributes of God explained, with thoughts on the church and the clergy. The author writes clearly because he thinks clearly. What we admire is his faculty of enunciating in a few sentences the result of profound cogitations on man, nature, and God. The catechism will prove most useful to those who are not afraid to think on certain subjects of high interest. It is both suggestive and valuable.

<sup>24</sup> "A Dialogue by way of Catechism, Religious, Moral, and Philosophical, for grown Men and Women Piously disposed, but of none of the Religious Denominations extant in the World." By a Physician. Parts I. and II. Ramsgate: Published by Thomas Scott.



The late Mr. Burgess undertook to show in a course of lectures, afterwards incorporated into a book, that the human race has sprung from a single pair, and that man has existed no longer on the earth than the Scripture chronology represents.<sup>25</sup> In pursuing his argument he surveys history, ethnology, physiology, language, tradition, mythology, and geology. The book is a compilation, destitute of a scientific or philosophical spirit, and the reasoning is unsatisfactory. The great antiquity of man on the globe has been proved by history, language, and geology. Egyptian records alone suffice to indicate the vast periods required for the development of the arts and sciences in the valley of the Nile. The writer, however, tries to explain away all facts and arguments militating against the Scriptural record taken as literal history; supposes the deluge of Noah to have occurred as related; and assumes that there was sufficient time between it and the Christian era for the doings and wanderings of man which are commonly thought to indicate his great antiquity. In aiming to gather up the best results reached by competent authorities on the various branches of the subject, we regret to find Mr. Burgess opposing all that do not coincide with the narrow view of the Old Testament he sets out with.

After the lapse of thirty years, Berthold Auerbach has republished his German version of Spinoza's works,<sup>26</sup> carefully revised, and enlarged with all the materials brought to light since 1841, especially the treatise "*De Deo et homine ejusque felicitate*," first published by Van Vloten, and afterwards from a better MS. by Schaarschmidt. The version of this treatise, which is at the end of the second volume of the present work, proceeds from the Bonn Professor himself, who has compared the two MSS. containing it. The leading characteristic of Auerbach's version is its literal fidelity, so that little light is thrown upon the meaning of the original. The translator, however, has prefixed a copious life; and Spinozitic literature is indebted to the novelist for many interesting incidents, as well as a perspicuous version.

Mr. Peebles takes a wide range in his "*Seers of the Ages*,"<sup>27</sup> discoursing on ancient historic spiritualism, Christian spiritualism, mediæval spiritualism, modern spiritualism, and exegetical spiritualism, without giving a clear or rational definition of what spiritualism is. He quotes many testimonies in its favour, indulges in high-flown eulogies on its wonderful revelations as well as its blessed effects, writes in extravagant language about many things remotely or not at all connected with it, but proves nothing as to the real presence of good or of evil spirits manifesting themselves by true signs. Like an enthusiastic believer in the intangible and supersensuous, his imagination carries

---

<sup>25</sup> "*What is Truth! An Inquiry concerning the Antiquity and Unity of the Human Race; with an Examination of recent Scientific Speculations on those Subjects.*" By Rev. E. Burgess, A.M. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

<sup>26</sup> "*B. De Spinoza's sammtliche Werke.*" Aus dem Lateinischen, mit einer Lebensgeschichte Spinoza's, von Berthold Auerbach. London: D. Nutt.

<sup>27</sup> "*Seers of the Ages: embracing Spiritualism Past and Present, Doctrines Stated, and Moral Tendencies Defined.*" By J. M. Peebles. London: J. Burns.

him away in lofty flights of rhetorical wordiness, through which a thin thread of sober sense runs fitfully. With high aims and benevolent aspirations for humanity, the writer does nothing to show that modern spiritualism is capable of rational proof. Yet he is a man of reading and reflection, after a fashion, with a judgment greatly at fault. The book is more amusing than instructive, fuller of reveries and rambling writing than of calm sense.

The second book by Mr. Peebles, on Jesus,<sup>28</sup> is a better specimen of authorship than the first, containing chapters on the existence, origin, and mission of Jesus; his moral teachings compared with those of the old philosophers; the influence of Christianity and the positive religion; meaning by the latter spiritualism. According to the writer, the leading thoughts of Jesus, the divine man, were the divine Fatherhood of God, the universal brotherhood of man, the perpetual ministry of angels and spirits, with the absolute necessity of toleration, charity, forgiveness, love. These he denominates *the positive religion*. We fear that the millennium dreamt of by Mr. Peebles, when universal love will reign in all hearts, is far distant. The work, with all its extravagance and absence of practicalness, will repay perusal.

Mr. Baring-Gould has given us a curious collection of legends relating to Old Testament persons, from Adam to Zechariah.<sup>29</sup> The stories associated with these characters are the offspring of oriental ingenuity and imagination, having a very slight basis, if any, in reality or truth. It is possible indeed, that some historical incidents may have been orally preserved; but the attempt to separate the fictitious from the genuine would be vain even in that case. The incidents here collected from various sources are often entertaining, often trifling, often absurd. By making a diligent use of Weil, Tabari, Eisenmenger, Bartolucci, the book of Jashar, D'Herbelot, and other sources, the author has produced a readable book; though it bears marks of haste, and is rather unscholarly. Sometimes he takes his matter from sources which are not the best. The "Talmud and Targums" are always quoted at second-hand. The omissions are also apparent, and detract from the merit of the work. Thus the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" are said to have been published by Grabe and Fabricius, without mention of Sinker's recent edition, so much better and more complete. Of the book of Enoch, Mr. Gould knows nothing except from Dillmann and Ewald, though Hilgenfeld has thrown light on it since they wrote. Speaking of the pre-Adamites, he tells us that Isaac de la Peyreire published a curious treatise in 1655. The Huguenot nobleman published two Latin treatises, the "Exercitationes" and the "Systema Theologicum, pars prima." Instead of saying that the Gnostics called Noah's wife Noria, it would have been more correct to state, that in a Gnostic book, mentioned by Epiphanius, she is so named; but the name is also in the Ebionite "Ascents of James." The

<sup>28</sup> "Jesus: Myth, Man, or God; or Popular Theology and the Positive Religion Contrasted." By J. M. Peebles. London: J. Burns.

<sup>29</sup> "Legends of Old Testament Characters, from the Talmud and other sources." By the Rev. S. Baring-Gould, M.A. London: Macmillan and Co.

author should spend more time in elaborating his works, for he is capable of better things than hasty compilations of legendary lore. His vast miscellaneous reading and retentive memory supply ample materials for the composition of more valuable books.

Professor Blackie has published a readable and interesting series of essays on four phases of ethics, expounding them with a vocabulary and wealth of illustration which make them attractive to a wider class than philosophers.<sup>20</sup> As a popular discourses he possesses many excellences—clearness, vivacity, breadth of view, enthusiasm. With wonderful self-complacency he ranges over the field of mind and morals, enunciating his ideas in felicitous language enlivened by unexpected turns and similes. The first lecture, which is on Socrates and is probably the best in the volume, generalizes the moral philosophy of the Athenian sage in two propositions—viz., that man is naturally a sympathetic and social animal; that he is also naturally a reasoning animal, and is only a man truly when reason controls his conduct. After alluding to the paradox that knowledge is virtue, and vice ignorance, the Professor treats of the method of teaching, the theological opinions and religious life, the political opinions and public life of Socrates, with the circumstances that led to his death. As to Aristotle, the starting-point of his ethical teaching is said to be the *τέλος* and the *ἀγαθόν*; virtue or right conduct is found in the mean between two extremes; in exercising the peculiar faculty of reason, and so fulfilling man's destiny. In considering Christian ethics, Mr. Blackie examines their native force, as also the particular virtues which Christianity's method of operation and moral power brings forward with a certain preference. The fourth lecture, after objecting to the name Utilitarianism, and suggesting *externalism* instead, animadverts on Locke, Hartley, Paley, Hume, Bentham, the Mills, and Bain. The key-note of Mr. Blackie's teachings lies in the belief of God-given instincts; innate moral distinctions; a soul implanted by the great First Cause or Being, recognising intuitively the difference between right and wrong, and guiding to everlasting happiness when allowed its proper control. The discursive talents of the author are unfavourable to precise analysis, so that a short and accurate statement of the essence of the Socratic or Aristotelian ethics need hardly be expected. The important terms, *truth*, *reason*, *virtue*, *science*, are employed loosely, or at least with insufficient exactness, in describing the characteristic features of ethical systems. On pages 51 and 52, reason, truth, justice, and knowledge, are all identified; while a list of "intellectual virtues" consist of foresight, calculation, prudence in every shape, trained talent, professional experience, and substantial work on scientific principles in all trades and occupations." In another place he speaks of "innate human actions." At pp. 97, &c., he misinterprets an isolated sentence in the *Westminster Review*, and even misquotes the words in

<sup>20</sup> "Four Phases of Morals,—Socrates, Aristotle, Christianity, Utilitarianism." By John Stuart Blackie, Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas.

page 9, showing that he has not a right idea of *law*, when describing it as merely "a steady, self-consistent *method of operation*." We hold that marks of intelligence are properly grouped under the conception of law, and that the lecturer in opposing this makes the reviewer propound the unintelligible statement that "a wider view of things absorbs *the original feeling of design* into the singular conception of *LAW*." The professor is smart and acute, rather than profound. His zeal is exuberant on behalf of the just and the true, as he views them. Hence he gives utterance to many noble sentiments. In some parts he is very successful, as in the causes of the failure of Christianity, and the way in which true ethics have suffered. In combating utilitarianism however, he is less happy. The last lecture is unsatisfactory. Its faults are patent to any attentive reader. The chief of these is an assumption of certain innate ideas or divine instincts which are rather to be attributed to human culture and development. There is a tendency, indeed, to push everything to excess. The author is constantly turning off into cognate topics, running against men of note, such as Hobbes, Comte, Darwin, Grote, Buckle, and others, speaking contemptuously of democracy, and dogmatizing in a supercilious tone unworthy of a philosopher. Thus, he speaks of "the extreme nonsensicality of Mill." By denying divinely-implemented instincts in the region of emotion and volition, "a whole school of meagre moralists, from Hume to John Stuart Mill, have either dragged themselves ingloriously in the mire, or entangled themselves in a tissue of the sorriest sophistries." Again: "If James Mill did study Plato thoroughly, it must have been, as Grote has done in our time, for the purpose of not understanding him." It would be easy to show how he fails in metaphysical acuteness, misinterprets the exact idea of "general laws," and *assumes* important propositions in order to knock down opponents. But with all his grotesque oddities, he is very cautious in the lecture on Christianity, steering clear of heresy. This, indeed, is a superficial essay, in which the author betrays want of acquaintance with the New Testament books, and adduces the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount along with the sentiments of Paul, or Peter, or John. In one place he even puts Paul's words indicating passive obedience to the civil power [Romans xiii. 1] along with the noted saying of Christ's "Render unto Cæsar, &c.," as though they were identical. He also takes the epistle to the Hebrews as Paul's, identifying diverse views of faith in the epistles to the Romans and Hebrews. He speaks of "the burning epistles of St. Paul to the young Christian churches in Rome and Ephesus," not knowing that the Ephesian letter does not belong to the assumed authorship. The nationality of the writer is strong, and sometimes gives rise to incongruous comparisons. Thus in Socrates we get a very modern Scotch friend with a very ancient Greek face; "the venerable prophet of Chelsea." The Apostle Paul and Dr. Chalmers are put together; while even Hume, with his atheistical philosophy, is "our subtle Scotch David." These, however, are harmless idiosyncrasies. What we desiderate in the enthusiastic lecturer is a juster appre-

ciation of the opinions of the illustrious modern philosophers from whom he differs, a clear proof that emotions or innate ideas can be a standard of morality, and a capacity for comprehending the problems of ethical science on their own basis apart from the systems of Socrates or Aristotle. He assumes the office of a preacher too conspicuously ; and though his teaching has a liberal tone, it is rather dogmatic and controversial.

Mr. Levin's Lectures<sup>31</sup> are intended to show the distinctive spirit pervading the later manifestations of Greek speculative opinion, or in other words to describe a part of the history of Greek philosophy comprised within the last three centuries before the commencement of the Christian era. After an introductory lecture, he proceeds to examine the Pyrrhonian system, in which a sceptical method was employed as an instrument for the attainment of virtue, and a feeling of doubt was established in the mind as to the reality of external objects or their qualities, thus suppressing desire for the object and producing a state of inaction. The third Lecture states and illustrates the grounds of scepticism, the *ten τρόποι* or arguments by which the Pyrrhonists attempted to demonstrate the impossibility of determining the nature from the appearance of the thing, the cause from the effect. In the fourth Lecture, the psychology of the Stoics is expounded, whose basis consisted in maintaining the complete passivity of the mind under the influence of external objects, and the non-existence of any mind prior to its reception of external impressions. The fifth Lecture is occupied with an exposition of the New Academy doctrines, taking Carneades as their representative ; and the sixth discourses on idealism and scepticism, ancient and modern. Two appendices are subjoined. The author has studied the subjects with great care and conscientious diligence. His examination of the sceptical philosophy is the best in the English language ; that of the New Academy is equally accurate and full. Not only is he familiar with the ancient philosophies expounded, but also with modern theories. His remarks on Mansel and Sir W. Hamilton in the last lecture, are acute and just. The volume is admirably adapted to the wants of students. But while the matter is excellent the manner is susceptible of improvement. The Greek and Latin quotations inserted in the text should be relegated to notes ; and a literal version should always be given. The style is stiff and academic, betokening a man unaccustomed to composition and awkward in its exercise. The valuable discussions might have been presented in a more acceptable form. But where the essential thing is so thoroughly handled, the mode is of less consequence. The work is a good text-book, foreshadowing important service in the field of philosophy by the same scholar.

Mr. Thomson has written a curious book about a new world of being, which it is difficult to understand, though he tries to make

---

<sup>31</sup> "Six Lectures Introductory to the Philosophical Writings of Cicero, with some Explanatory Notes on the subject-matter of the *Academica* and *De Finibus*." By T. W. Levin, M.A. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co.

his meaning clear, and to demonstrate the important proposition discovered." He holds then—

"That there is a world of spirits; that we, the conscious knowers, are just now in the world of spirits; that we, the knowers, are rounded beings in the world of spirits; that we, the conscious knowers, can never, in our present state, see this our proper selves; that the utmost that we, the conscious knowers can do, and that with the greatest possible difficulty, is to know that we, the conscious knowers, are such absolute and rounded existences; that, in a word, the utmost that man can do is to know that he exists, and that the human race hitherto have not known that they existed."

The author emancipating *the conscious and knowing we or ourselves* from *mind* as well as animal being, has discovered *absolute existence*. Men viewed in this light, receive personality, are sent out from God and create the worlds; for God personally has done nothing as far as we know. He makes men do the whole; they, the sons, and not the Father, are the authors of all the known. Thus the new world of being supposed to be discovered is man's spiritual existence. The greater part of the book is devoted to *the demonstration* of the proposition. The metaphysics, theology, and spiritualism of the writer, mixed up together as they are, form a strange compound. There is no discovery; nothing new that is intelligible or different from what was already known of man's existence; while the problem of humanity is clothed in a garb of words conveying no true idea. The author has deluded himself with a haze of vague imaginings. His idealism is unreal and unhealthy. In divorcing consciousness from mind, and in relegating it to a sphere outside mind, called the spiritual or world of spirits, he does violence to true philosophy. It is a curious way of reconciling man to himself to tell him that he is the direct author of the universe, and therefore should not attribute to God what is simply his own creation.

Mr. Hinton's book on "Man and his Dwelling-place" seems to have found readers, for it is in a third edition.<sup>22</sup> The singular character of the production helps to account for its apparent popularity. Except in one point, the doctrine of universal salvation, it is a form of orthodox theology attached to external nature and human perception. The book presents a semi-philosophical, mystic, spiritualized orthodoxy, the expression of an earnest man's struggles to emancipate himself from the chains of a hard orthodoxy in which he was brought up, by the help of ontology and science. Unable, however, to apprehend the true principles of science, and devoid of philosophical grasp or insight, he has failed to interpret man and nature in their proper relations, mystifying himself with figurative words which he turns and views and dwells upon till they appear to present certain fixed ideas to his imagination, and form a definite belief which he offers as a solu-

<sup>22</sup> "The Discovery of a New World of Being." By George Thomson. London: Longman and Co.

<sup>23</sup> "Man and his Dwelling-place. An Essay towards the Interpretation of Nature." By James Hinton. London: Smith, Elder, and Co.

tion of the deepest problems affecting humanity. According to the author's speculations, we are in relation to a spiritual world which is physical only through man's defectiveness. Its being physical to us is evidence of our dead state. Our defective state in the spiritual world leads us to perceive the phenomenal world as though it were real. The deadness of man is laid down in the New Testament, and Christ has died that man may be saved from death. The message of the New Testament in other words is, that men are damned, and God saves them from damnation or hell through believing. From this summary it will be seen how much the writer makes of that dualism in man's nature of which St. Paul speaks in figurative language. Because man is described as *dead* in sin—*i.e.* insensible to spiritual things, the word is here generalized and intensified till it is made to denote a great mental fact inherent in the constitution. To maintain such deadness or damnation in man, the author falls into the usual perverted view of the Bible; declares that the essence of nature is in its being "a spiritual fact," an "active existence;" and that to deal with phenomena alone is to deal with mere appearances which are illusive. We have seldom seen such jugglery played with a few terms; inertness or deadness, spiritual, and phenomenal. A right knowledge of the doctrine of consciousness and of perception would have prevented much of the confusion. In the act of perception one is conscious of an *ego* and a *non-ego*—of oneself as subject perceiving, and of a not-self as object perceived. What do we know of the latter? What constitutes the objective or real essence of things? Is it the primary qualities of matter? No. We have no knowledge of something existing in things over and above our *mere* knowledge of them. All the qualities of matter must be generalized into our *mere knowledge* of things. Mr. Hinton in attributing deadness to man robs him of all the knowledge of things which he has. In deriving his knowledge from the phenomena of nature wholly or in part, man is not under an illusion, because they are to him all that he can perceive or know. Of nature as it is in itself, he is ignorant. All that he can apprehend is the operation of forces or general laws. We need not show that the author is neither sound philosopher nor true theologian. If he were a good philosopher, he would not say, "Observation and the sound use of reason are the sole arbiters; our convictions and feelings and necessary persuasions are nothing." How does sound reason differ from the necessary persuasions? If he were a good theologian he would not speak of "eternal death," which is an unscriptural phrase. The book is unsatisfactory. Pantheistic mysticism and an orthodox manipulation of words give it an appearance of profound theology to which it has no claim. When a man says that "we falsely call ourselves persons. We want personality;" and that "God takes our death upon him," it is useless to expect from him a solution of the great problems of life and death, or even an intelligent perception of their nature. Notwithstanding its radical defects, the book has some good thoughts about love and self-sacrifice, the salvation of all men, and the imperfection of our present state. Its

materials are disposed in an attractive way, comprehensive and systematic. The heads science, religion, ethics, arrest attention. But their discussion proves disappointing, both from the emphatic iteration of a few ideas, and the awkward style in which they are clothed.

---

## POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES AND TRAVELS.

THE Committee of the Cobden Club<sup>1</sup> have been rendering the greatest service to political speculation by the important works they have been recently publishing. It is never probable that the very best books will instantly command a great commercial success, and therefore, even in the most prosperous condition of the publishing trade, it will generally not be the most improving works that will always be first placed before the public. It was a mark of Mr. Cobden's genius and an exhibition of his good fortune that he not only laid down broad principles of the most universal application, but also in his numerous public utterances traced out their remote ramifications in the whole field of practical politics. In this way the very same principles which induced him to advocate the restriction or abolition of indirect taxation, also caused him to detest war, and to do his utmost to promote Commercial Treaties. Thus, it is not a mere accidental assemblage of detached essays that the Committee of the Club devoted to Mr. Cobden's memory have produced, but a number of treatises on subjects having a close, though not always apparent, relation to each other, and finding, at the least, a point of union in Mr. Cobden's own political aspirations. The subjects treated in the present volume are, "The Causes of War and the Means of Reducing their Number; Primogeniture; the Present Aspect of the Land Question; Financial Reform; a proposed New Treaty of Commerce between England and Germany; English and International Coinage; Trade Unions, and the Relation of Capital and Labour; the Colonial Question, and the Economic and Financial History of the United States in Recent Years." Among such a mass of important subjects, which are all treated by peculiarly competent and well-informed writers (including foreigners like Mr. David A. Wells, of the United States, M. Emile de Lavelaye, and Herr Julius Fauchier), it is difficult to make a selection in order to convey a true notion of the general value of the matter. The careful and laborious article of Mr. Cliffe Leslie on Financial Reform may, however, be fairly taken as a specimen of the courageous attitude assumed by the writers and of the comprehensive and exhaustive mode of treatment adopted. The purpose of Mr. Leslie in this article is to discredit every possible mode of indirect taxation, though he devotes himself more especially to pointing out the dilemmas amidst which a Government is of necessity placed when once it takes upon itself to levy customs duties. The Government must either grant unrestricted liberty of im-

---

<sup>1</sup> "Cobden Club Essays." Second Series. 1871-72. London: Cassell. 1872.



portation and exportation to every spot on the coast, and along the rivers of the kingdom, thereby entailing an enormous army of tax collectors and an intolerable cost of collection ; or it must limit direct foreign trade to selected places, thus disturbing the natural order of things, and obstructing the development of numerous localities. It must either exact immediate payment of the duties on importation, thereby wasting capital, harassing merchants, and mulcting consumers ; or it must establish the system of "bonding," and encounter a fresh dilemma between covering the kingdom with warehouses and customs' officials, or confining the advantages of "bonding" unfairly to particular places. It must extend the duty on any particular import to all its possible substitutes, thereby incurring heavy cost in collecting unproductive taxes on articles of which the main uses, moreover, may not be those which it was intended to tax ; or else the tax must be confined to the principal import, in which case it may be evaded by substitutes, thereby depriving the public of the best article without profit to the State. Mr. Leslie supports his argument throughout by the most skilful use of the most irrefutable statistics, and towards the close of his essay makes suggestions for filling up the gaps in the revenue to be made by the proposed abolition of customs' duties, and indeed of all indirect taxation. Mr. Leslie would raise the income tax to one shilling in the pound, and convert the present probate, administration, legacy, and succession duties into a uniform tax on successions to all descriptions of property, real or personal, and whether descending by will or on intestacy. In place of land being subject to lighter succession duty than personalty (as it now is, by both escaping an equivalent to probate duty, and succession duty being charged only on the life interest of the successor), it is urged that, were the Legislature bent on drawing a distinction, it ought to be in favour of personalty, which does not increase in value like land, but, on the contrary, tends to deterioration. Mr. Leslie is finally of opinion that the reduction he advocates in indirect taxation would tell so favourably on the wealth of the country that the increase of income tax would scarcely be felt, while "reform in the laws relating to land, reform of the laws relating to women, and reform of the system of jurisprudence," would co-operate in the same direction. An essay of peculiar value at the present time is contributed by M. Lavelaye on the "Causes of War, and the Means of Reducing their Number." The essay contains an interesting historical resumé of the main classes of facts to which the most notorious European wars have owed their origin ; such as religion, the balance of power, intervention in the internal affairs of other countries, traditional antipathies, race, national boundaries, conquest, colonial possessions, imperfect political institutions, duties of neutral states, and accident. M. de Lavelaye examines into the degree in which these classes of facts are likely to operate in the future, and the mode in which that operation may be restricted or counteracted. He advocates especially the adoption of every expedient likely to foster community of views and identity of interests among nations ; such as a reduction of import duties, treaties of commerce, reduction of tariffs for the conveyance of goods, of letters,

and of telegrams ; the adoption of a uniform system of coins, weights, measures, and commercial laws ; the support of representative institutions everywhere, industrial undertakings, and instruction in foreign languages. The general adoption of arbitration and the institution of a high judicial court of nations are of course alleged to be imperious necessities.

An intelligent inquiry by an English traveller into the condition of the Southern States of America at the present time is likely to supply the best possible commentary on the events of the war, and on the general question of slavery. Mr. Somers' work<sup>2</sup> is a careful and laborious account of what he really saw on a visit to the Southern States, and the investigation is the more important, on some accounts, because it was undertaken for no special purpose, mercantile or political. The two great problems in the South, and, in fact, in the whole nation, just now are the training and civilization of the negro, and the speedy payment of the national debt. The testimony generally borne of the negroes in Virginia is that they work readily when regularly paid. Wherever Mr. Somers consulted an effective employer, either in the manufacturing works of Richmond or on the farms and plantations, such is the opinion that with little variation was given. In the country, negroes get from eight to ten dollars a month, with house and provisions. In Richmond, for common and ordinary labour they are paid fifteen dollars a month with provisions, or thirty dollars where they find themselves in the necessaries of life. In various branches of more or less skilled labour of which negroes are capable, the wages are much higher, and approach the standard of remuneration to white men in the same occupations. The Radical party in Virginia take credit for having opened schools in Richmond, immediately after the war, for the education of negro children. They say that from 5000 to 6000 were thus brought under instruction, while many of the white children are untaught. One of the debateable points in South Carolina at present is as to the best mode of remunerating the negro farm labourer, by a share of the crop or by wages. It is said that the share system tends to render the negro indifferent to and reluctant to perform any kind of work on a plantation which does not bear immediately on the corn and cotton crops in which he has a share. The share system implies rations to the negro from the beginning of the year to the end, and if the rations for a week are consumed in half that time, an additional supply must be given, which places the negro so heavily in debt to his employer by the time the picking season has come, that he is apt, more especially under declining prices, to be regardless of the financial results of the partnership with his employer into which he entered in January. The system is, however, strongly defended by persons of practical experience, though Mr. Somers condemns it as being "more like a half-way slavery than any relation of capital and labour of an advanced type." Mr. Somers says that the Federal taxation is

---

<sup>2</sup> "The Southern States since the War, 1870-71." By Robert Somers. London : Macmillan. 1871.

rendered unnecessarily oppressive and injurious by the American weakness of "protection to native industry," and the American ambition of paying off the national debt. This is being effected by paying off a million dollars a month, the whole debt consisting of two or three thousand millions.

It is interesting, if it were not lamentable or disastrous, to read grave works and republished speeches devoted to raising up again from the dead the buried doctrines of Protection.<sup>3</sup> Unfortunately, the peculiar situation of the British colonies and the pressure of the public debt upon the United States are producing a temporary hallucination on that subject which cannot be too deeply deplored. A good specimen of the reasoning which is prevalent in some parts of the United States is presented by the "Speeches, Addresses, and Letters" of Mr. William D. Kelley, a member of Congress. He expresses a hope that the Constitution will be so amended as to permit an export duty being laid on cotton. The result would be, it is alleged, that the men of the Cotton States, no longer dependent on England for a market for their bulky raw material, would, with their cheaper fabrics, drive her cotton goods from the markets of the world. Mr. Kelley says that though he would not, by legislation, prohibit the export of any branch of manufacture or machinery, he would endeavour to retain in the country many of the elements of manufactures that now go abroad, by making them more valuable in the country than anywhere else. Mr. Kelley shows a more enlightened and far-sighted wisdom when he says that—"What is required to regenerate the South is subsoil ploughs, phosphates, agricultural implements generally, a large increase of horses, mules, and horned cattle, and such manufacturing machinery as can be moved by water-power. These, with a comparatively small amount of cash capital, and a few earnest men to teach others their use and value, would in a few years make the South bloom like a garden and develop a population as loyal as was that of any northern State during the war."

The publication of some of the most celebrated of Mr. George W. Julian's speeches is a rich gift to Englishmen at the present day.<sup>4</sup> These speeches not only cover all the most important questions that have been stirred for the last thirty years in the United States, but include the description of so many broad political principles of universal application that they cannot be read without the utmost profit in any country whatever. The work is prefaced by an interesting introduction furnishing an account of Mr. Julian's political career, which indirectly sketches out the main historical events in recent American history. Mr. Julian was admitted to the bar in 1840, and has practised law ever since, in his native place, with the interruptions incident to an active political career. In 1845 he was elected to the Legislature

---

<sup>3</sup> "Speeches, Addresses, and Letters on Industrial and Financial Questions." By William D. Kelley, M.C. Philadelphia: 1871.

<sup>4</sup> "Speeches on Political Questions." By George W. Julian. With an Introduction by L. Maria Child. New York: 1871.

of Indiana, where he distinguished himself by his earnest opposition to (what his biographer calls) "the barbarism of capital punishment," and by his exertions to prevent the repudiation of the State Debts. He began an active advocacy of "Anti-Slavery" principles, and he was elected to Congress in 1849. He fought against the "Fugitive Slave Bill," and laboured strenuously to restrict the boundaries of Texas, which had managed to gain admission into the Union as a new Slave State. In the Secession War he urged the emancipation of the slaves long before it took place, and, in fact, from the beginning of the struggle; he argued in favour of arming the negroes of the South as an act of justice as well as of military necessity; he maintained that it was a duty to confiscate the lands of rebels, as a measure of war, and also to furnish homesteads for the soldiers and sailors of the United States; he earnestly demanded the punishment of rebel leaders; he laboured for the safe reconstruction of rebel States; he zealously advocated all the amendments to the constitution for the diffusion of universal freedom and equality of civil rights; and he was the first of the public men in the United States who demanded the suffrage for the emancipated slaves. Mr. Julian also introduced and advocated a proposition to grant the right of suffrage to women in the district of Columbia, and in the territories of the United States. The following passage on Negro Suffrage in the District of Columbia will afford a good specimen of Mr. Julian's eloquence, as it supplies a mode of argument of very general application in suffrage debates:—"In the next place, fitness is a relative term. Nobody is *perfectly* fit to vote, because nobody is perfectly informed as to all the subjects of our legislation and policy. Of the millions in our land who regularly go to the polls and toss up on the gravest questions, how many could even stand a tolerable examination in political economy, or constitutional law, or political ethics? How many men of good sense and fair intelligence could give a well-defined reason for even their most decided opinions?" He says further, that "universal suffrage is one of the surest means of securing a higher level of intelligence for the whole people."

The present move that is being made in the most advanced and enlightened political circles in Europe in favour of remedying the transparent evils of majority voting derives considerable illustration from the variety and energy of the works constantly appearing on the subject, not only in this country, but in France, Switzerland, and Italy. A considerable amount of agreement is gradually being obtained by the best speculators on the subject, both as regards the evils to be corrected, the final ends to be arrived at, and even the intermediate remedies which admit of at once being applied. M. Taine,\* indeed, with reference to the special diseases incident to Universal Suffrage in France, recommends what he calls Universal Suffrage "in two degrees"—that is, a resort to the same expedient which is employed in the United States for the election of the President. M.

---

\* "Du Suffrage Universel et de la Manière de voter." Par H. Taine. Paris : 1872.

Taine's arguments, indeed, founded as they are on the assumption of the hopeless political feebleness and servility of his countrymen, are indeed in themselves irresistible. They amount in fact to the assertion that the only question is who shall dominate over the voters and take their place in the government of the nation, Government nominees and persons in the pay of the Government, or an order of persons spontaneously elected by the people, who in their turn shall directly choose the deputies. M. Taine says he knows only two objections to this solution of the problem; the one, that the Radical papers will say "the people will have their rights stolen from them;" the other, that the workmen in the great towns will be discontented. It is not necessary to criticize M. Taine's solution, which, certainly, is not quite so bad as the atrocious perversions of representative machinery now prevailing in France. M. Ernest Naville,<sup>6</sup> who has contributed two valuable works on the subject as presented in France and other countries, is of opinion that the most appropriate system of representation for France at the present day is that advocated by M. Walter Baily,<sup>7</sup> and to which the name of "Uninominal Suffrage" has been given. This system, which is only a modification of Mr. Hare's, has been already expounded in this *Review*, and will be found compendiously described in Mr. H. A. Droop's<sup>8</sup> important contribution to the subject styled "Proportional Representation as applied to the election of Local Governing Bodies." According to the Uninominal system, each candidate publishes a list indicating, according to the order of his preference, the other candidate to whom he wishes to transfer the superfluous or insufficient votes. The elector votes for a single candidate. The superfluous and insufficient votes are then transferred according to the lists which the candidates have deposited. M. Ernest Naville, and, indeed, the writers on the topic generally, agree that, if it can be obtained, what is called "Personal Representation," or the complete representation of the electors, without help from the candidates or from political parties (by means of what is called "Proportional Representation"), is far the most just and generally expedient. Mr. Droop says that the principal obstacle at present to the introduction of the system of "the preferential voting" in this country, though by that alone "Personal representation" can be carried out, seems to be an exaggerated estimate of the political difficulties supposed to be involved in the sorting and distribution of the voting papers. He goes on to say that it would be very useful if these supposed difficulties could be practically tested through the application of preferential voting to some School Board or other public elections. He quotes from the *New York Nation* of

---

<sup>6</sup> "La Réforme Electorale en France." Par Ernest Naville. Paris: 1871.  
 "La Question Electorale en Europe et en Amérique." Par Ernest Naville. Genève et Bâle. 1871.

<sup>7</sup> "Proportional Representation in Large Constituencies." By Walter Baily, M.A. London: Ridgway.

<sup>8</sup> "Proportional Representation as Applied to the Election of Local Governing Bodies." By H. A. Droop, M.A. London: Wildy. 1871.

June 1st, 1871, which, after suggesting that Mr. Hare's system or some other system of contingent representation should be introduced into an Illinois Public Library Bill and applied to the election of the directors, adds—"We are persuaded that it will never be introduced into our politics, until after its merits have been proved in an election with which politics have or shall have nothing to do." These remarks suggest a hint to writers on this subject that they will do well to avail themselves of. They are all alive to the moral and political importance of the changes they advocate, and some of them (as, for instance, Signor F. Genala, in his interesting chapter on the "moral and political effects of such changes,"<sup>9</sup>) have made them a marked feature in their argument. Nevertheless, they do not generally distinguish clearly enough between the two classes of advantages. Most of the systems recommended imply a considerable change in the constitution of the country adopting it, over and above the change implied in the professed representative system being made real and effective. This is especially the case in Mr. Archibald Dobbs' system,<sup>10</sup> the second edition of whose pamphlet (which we have already had occasion to notice) is now published. He is, however, in a peculiar degree, awake to the consequences his system involves. The essence of his method is that candidates with an excess or defect in the number of votes should themselves determine, *after the voting*, to which of the candidates with a defect in the number of votes the useless votes should be apportioned. It is obvious that the influence of party leaders is made stronger by this method; but so far from deprecating this, Mr. Dobbs thinks it an advantage, inasmuch as the elector may give his vote to any one he chooses, and to the head of any party he chooses, or to the head of no party. Mr. Dobbs' whole system, which is carefully brought out in his pamphlet, is well worth studying, though it includes too much of M. Taine's system of election "by two degrees," to compete in an advanced country with the "preferential" system of Mr. Hare in its new and improved form.

Mr. Homersham Cox<sup>11</sup> has conceived and produced a very useful form of book, though of rather an ephemeral character, in giving a careful resumé, not too lengthy or detailed, of the events of a single Parliamentary session. The subjects treated of in the account of the session of 1871 include a review of the discussions and divisions on foreign affairs, army reform, expenditure and finance, the ballot, and what Mr. Cox calls "domestic legislation," reaching to such matters as the Lodgers' Goods Protection Act, the Bank Holidays' Act, the

---

<sup>9</sup> "Libertà e Democrazia studi sulli Rappresentanza delle Minorità." Milano. 1871.

<sup>10</sup> "Della Libertà ed Equivalenza dei Suffragi nelle Elezioni ovvero della Proporzionale Rappresentanza delle Maggioranze e Minoranze." Studio critico dell'Avv. F. Genala. Milano. 1871.

<sup>11</sup> "General Representation on a Complete Readjustment and Modification of Mr. Hare's Plan." By Archibald Dobbs, M.A. Second Edition. London: Longmans. 1872.

<sup>12</sup> "The Session of 1871: an Epitome of its Labours and Results." By Homersham Cox, M.A. Longmans. 1871.

Universities' Tests Act, and the Trades' Union Act. In commenting on the conduct of business during the session, Mr. Cox complains of the practice of making a general survey of the universe on the motion for going into Committee of Supply:—"This grand old principle was, in the days of the Stuarts, the most potent means of asserting constitutional rights. But at present the rule which gives precedence to grievances has been so absurdly distorted that it is a mere caricature." Another abuse complained of by Mr. Cox is the practice of repeatedly moving adjournments. Some lingering sense of decency has hitherto restrained the use of this obstructive process, but in the last session it was applied with impudent frequency. There were twelve divisions on motions that the House do adjourn, twenty on motions that the debate be adjourned, and seventeen in committee that the chairman report progress or leave the chair. To those who know anything of the usage of Parliament, these figures tell their own tale."

In republishing some sketches of "Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland," Mr. Lecky<sup>12</sup> takes occasion to make some comments on the existing political relations of England and Ireland. Mr. Lecky conceives that the idea of nationality lies just as much at the root of Irish discontent as in the case of Hungary and Poland. What discontent was felt against the Protestant Established Church, was felt Mr. Lecky thinks, because it was regarded as an English garrison sustaining an anti-national system; and the agrarian difficulty never assumed its full intensity till by the Repeal agitation the landlords had been politically alienated from the people. Mr. Lecky is of opinion that the three great requisites for good government in Ireland are, that it should be strong, that it should be just, and that it should be national. "By steadily opposing the tendency to centralization, which has produced so many evils in Ireland; by transferring private business from the over-worked Parliament of the empire to cheaper and more competent local tribunals; by gradually enlarging the sphere of local government; and by economizing and bringing into activity the political talent of the country, a sound public opinion may be slowly formed. Local government in Ireland, in as far as it exists, presents on the whole a very remarkable and very satisfactory contrast to the political condition of the country."

We have to thank Dr. Ernst von Plener<sup>13</sup> for giving in a historical form a summary view of recent English legislation (that is, since the year 1831), for the control of manufactures, including the Factory Acts and Acts regulating the employment of women and children. The work, which is very concise, includes a survey not merely of the bare Acts of Parliament, but of the social facts and reports of Commissions which led to the several Acts being passed. The author admits, however, that the largest manufacturers, at the time that the more

<sup>12</sup> "The Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland: Swift, Flood, Grattan, O'Connell." By William Edward Hartpole Lecky, M.A. London: Longmans. 1871.

<sup>13</sup> "Die Englische Fabrik-Gesetzgebung." Von Dr. Ernst von Plener. Wien. 1871.

important Acts were passed, were already spontaneously making the improvements contemplated by the Acts, and that the health of their labourers had become a matter of grave concern with them. It is also admitted that it is more easy to carry out legislation of this sort in large manufacturing centres than in obscure rural villages. These considerations point to the general superfluity or inadequacy of this kind of protective legislation in principle, though in the case of cruel charges, and in the employment of young children for a length of time, or at trades or manufactures obviously injurious to them, a simple and universal criminal law might be the least objectionable remedy. It is to be hoped that the growing power of trades unions and the claims of national education will in no long time render the protective legislation of the sort here under consideration obsolete.

The publication of Mr. Chesson's<sup>14</sup> *Lecture on India* is very valuable. Taking for granted that he speaks to an audience who abhor the memory of Warren Hastings' grasping policy, and the similar conduct of which our earliest representatives in India were commonly guilty, and recognising the marked improvement under a later series of Indian administrators until the era of annexation under Lord Dalhousie came to disgrace England once more, Mr. Chesson details the acts of those eight years of unscrupulous spoliation which added to British territory 260,000 square miles of native property. He shows Lord Dalhousie to have been without the excuse of pressure from England that might be urged in defence of Warren Hastings, and to have been only just supported in his course of action by the concurrence of the Home government. With a passing word of recognition of the merits of the statesman whose unhappy murder has, since the publication of the lecture, given, on any interpretation of it, fresh point to all questions concerned with our relations with India, Mr. Chesson dwells shortly on the difficulties surrounding those relations which are most pressingly felt at the present moment, and especially directs attention to the fact that the Indian Government has repeatedly exhibited a disposition to ignore the Queen's Proclamation to the Princes, Chiefs, and People of India, which promises to respect the rights, dignity, and honour of native princes as her own. He points out that, although so much has been swallowed up under false pretexts, yet it is worth while to pause and reflect and reform our policy, since one-third of the population and area of India "are occupied by native states which enjoy many of the privileges of self-government, and whose fidelity to the suzerain power can only be secured by the continued maintenance of the rights of treaties." The particular instances of this tendency to break faith, cited by Mr. Chesson, are the following:—The Mussulman mercenaries of the Principality of Dhar mutinied and seized the fort of Dhar during the mutiny of 1857. There is no evidence whatever that the native government was accessory to this; but the State was ordered to be

---

<sup>14</sup> "The Princes of India : Their Rights and Our Duties." By F. W. Chesson. London : Tinsdale. 1873.



annexed. The Rajah was just dead, and his heir had not yet been proclaimed. On the excuse that the native government, under such circumstances, had shown itself incompetent to control the population, the recognition of the heir was refused, and it was only by Lord Stanley's (Secretary of State for India) firm declaration that we could not punish a native State for an incompetency similar to that we were ourselves at the same moment showing, that the Indian Government was compelled to proclaim the young Rajah. Even then it confiscated the treasure and jewels of the State, and shared them among our troops. The next case is that of the "Mysore Adoption case." Lord Canning inferred from a conversation with the Maharajah that he intended to bequeath his Principality to the Indian Government. But this proved to be a mistaken idea, and an heir was adopted in 1865. Lord Canning refused to recognise the adoption, although it was a right inherent in the succession, and not one which the British Government was competent either to bestow or to take away. Mr. Bright brought the case into strong relief in its true colours in the House of Commons, and the young Rajah was raised to the "musnud." The case of the Nawab of Tonk was brought before Parliament during the last session, and is yet undecided. He is a Mahomedan of unimpeached loyalty, and his father was our firm friend during the mutiny of 1857, and his reign has been marked by great improvements in his territories. By various reforms he became unpopular with the more lawless of his subjects, and a powerful feudatory chief called the Thakoor of Lawa gave him much trouble. This chieftain, with his retainers, visited Tonk, on invitation, in July 1867, and went to the house of one of the Nawab's ministers, where an affray took place and many lives were lost. There are absolutely conflicting statements as to who was the aggressor. On the opinion of Colonel W. F. Eden, the Governor-General's agent for the States of Rajpootana, the Nawab was deposed and banished, the territories were split up, and the minister imprisoned in one of the unhealthiest places in India. Although the Nawab has appealed against this treatment, no judicial inquiry has yet been made into the case. The Nawab Nazim of Bengal, with whose ancestors the Indian Government has entered into repeated treaty engagements, each representing a greater amount of encroachment on the power and resources of the native princes, is now told that his ancestors were never independent of our Government, that the treaties were individual and not hereditary, and that his application to Parliament for an inquiry whether he is being justly treated must be contemptuously refused. The Rajah of Sooshung lost a portion of his territories through an inaccurate Government survey. He went to law about it, and obtained three separate favourable decisions. Still the Government refused to disgorge its prey; and, having injured the authority of the Prince, took advantage of the disorders that ensued, and confiscated the disputed property. Over and above a call for a complete reversal of our iniquitous policy towards India, Mr. Chesson would seek a special remedy for such abuses as these in the institution of a special court of appeal for Indian causes, to sit in England.

Society affords itself so little time in these days to look back at benefactors or heroes whose virtues can no longer be put in requisition to help its onward race, and even English political society has eyes so much too short-sighted to see far beyond the limits of its own islands, that it would seem very ungrateful were we not to welcome Colonel Malleson's<sup>15</sup> sketches of men yet living, but whose great deeds have been partially hidden from us by the distance of their scene. It is true that such contemporaneous biographies must be fired with the writer's love or hatred, since the time for dispassionate valuation is not yet come; but it is easy to allow for this, and the charm of a personal feeling of reverence and affection greatly adds to the attractiveness of this volume. To many readers the administrative ability shown by Lord Lawrence during his labours at Delhi, in the trans-Sutlej territory, in the Punjaub, as well as his prompt military genius in the mutiny, will be no new story; but the time of his viceroyalty, with its social reforms, is what has given him his hold on the esteem of his countrymen, whether they approve the pacific policy maintained or not. Colonel Malleson adduces facts to redeem Lord Lawrence's character for far-sighted capability from the shade cast on it by the Orissa famine. The Sketch of the Principles of Akbar might well have been written as an essay on the true principles of Indian government. The history of our own rule in India would have been very different had it been possible always to say of our representatives there, as was said of Akbar by one who was not his adherent, that they were like Akbar, who "conducted the affairs of this empire for fifty years with firmness and justice, watching over the tranquillity and happiness of all classes of his subjects, whether they were followers of Jesus, of Moses, or of Mahomed,—whether they were Hindûs, or Materialists, or believers in accident or chance. All enjoyed to the same degree his favour and protection." Among his directions to the collectors of his revenue were included:—"He must consider himself the immediate friend of the husbandman; must transact his business in a place to which everyone may find easy access; must promote the cultivation of such articles as will produce general profit and utility; must endeavour to act to the satisfaction of the husbandman." Colonel Malleson concludes this sketch with a warning against the centralization of authority in one hand. Under the title of "Madhajee Sindia" we have a compendious and useful summary of Mahratta history after 1689, till the time when Madhajee was struck down by fever in 1794, just at the moment when a last stroke of diplomacy and fortune was about to place him "in a position never before approached by a Mahratta," and one from which there is little doubt but that he hoped successfully to cope with and to destroy the growing British power in India. Sir Bartle Frere and Sir Vincent Eyre are enthusiastically portrayed as models of what should be found in the civil and the military services in India; nor are we forced to think of them as exceptions, but rather as some who have specially attracted public

---

<sup>15</sup> "Recreations of an Indian Official." By Lieut.-Colonel G. B. Malleson. London: Longmans. 1872.

attention out of the many who are with equal fidelity and devotion serving the interests of the great populations with whom they have to do. The shadow to these bright-coloured pictures is supplied by a striking narrative of "Dyce Sombre's Ancestor," a native of Strasburg, who, during the troublous times between the middle and end of the last century, forced himself into wealth and into a measure of political importance in India, by a career of unscrupulousness, immorality, and cruelty. The drawbacks to the book consist in its too great aptness to point Tory and other morals.

An account of a visit of only six weeks to the United States, contributed to a popular periodical by its editor, does not promise, on the face of it, more solidity than Dr. Macaulay's book affords.<sup>16</sup> It may to some extent help to supply the want that exists of that unexaggerated gossip about American life which alone can pretend to compensate those who are unable to make their own personal observations on the other side of the Atlantic; but the only chapters to which we should be disposed to turn for any real information would be those on the Common Schools in Chicago, and on the controversy as to the use of the Bible in the Schools of Cincinnati. The former of these summaries paints the condition of teachers and of the education they give in brighter colours than many of the equally well-authenticated reports known in this country, and is free from any of the doubts felt by some educators as to the real results of the American high-pressure system. In Cincinnati efforts were made and were defeated, first to exclude the reading of the Bible, and then to divide the "School-rate" among different denominations. A sketch of Chicago as it was a year before the fire is interesting. Perhaps it ought to be added that there is a good deal of material extracted from other writers and speakers, and that there are traces of a certain narrowness in the author's sphere of vision at home which has prevented his seeing much that might have been seen.

We have not often had before us for notice in this place a more important or more interesting work than the Reports of the Bureau of Statistics of Labour, established by the Legislature of Massachusetts, by a resolve which received the approval of the Governor on the 23rd day of June, 1869.<sup>17</sup> The duties of the bureau were to "collect, assort, systematize, and present in annual reports to the Legislature, on or before the 1st day of March in each year, statistical details relating to all departments of labour in the Commonwealth, especially in its relation to the commercial, industrial, social, educational, and sanitary condition of the labouring classes, and to the permanent prosperity of the productive industry of the Commonwealth." A number of questions were prepared by the Bureau and incorporated into circulars, which were then widely spread throughout the State. For many special employments special circulars were prepared and issued. Though the questions were of the most minute and, indeed,

<sup>16</sup> "Across the Ferry." By James Macaulay, M.A., M.D. Edin. Hodder and Stoughton. 1871.

<sup>17</sup> "Reports of the Bureau of Statistics of Labour, from August 2nd, 1869, to March 1st, 1870, and from March 1st, 1870, to March 1st, 1871." Boston. 1870-1871.

apparently inquisitorial kind, yet every precaution was taken to assure the respondents that the inquiries were made "with no intention of searching into their private affairs from motives of mere curiosity, but for the purpose of gathering statistics upon the great question of labour, the leading question now agitating the civilized world." One of the circulars (addressed to employés) contains as many as 137 questions, some of them of such a nature as the following:—"How did you acquire a knowledge of your present trade or employment?" "Do you teach your sons (if any) to follow the same trade, or desire them to follow it?" "Has the division of labour, consequent upon the introduction of new machinery, rendered your work more tedious and monotonous?" "Have you ever known long-continued or monotonous labour, by day or by night, or by both, to affect the health of your brain?" "Does your work exercise to any extent the higher faculties of your mind?" "What proportion of the working people, so far as you have had occasion to know, are in debt?" "Have you ever been engaged in any strike? If *yes*, was the object thereof for increase of wages or for shorter time? and did you engage therein *voluntarily* or compelled by surrounding circumstances?" It is obvious that the possibility of such questions being generally answered in a way likely to be of the slightest statistical service implies the presence of a high standard of education and intelligence among the respondents, as well as a thorough confidence in the good faith of the Government seeking the information. The results of these inquiries, and the comments of the Bureau upon them, between August 2nd, 1869, and March 1st, 1871, are contained in the two stout volumes before us. The work contains a sketch of English legislation, in reference to the poor, from the fourteenth century, for which the Hon. J. Lothrop Motley, Minister in England for the United States, supplied a complete catalogue of public documents. The matter in these volumes is, of course, of the greatest interest for English politicians, and the evidence on which the conclusions rest is, of course, of the most reliable kind. On one subject, of much moment at the present stage of English legislation, the Bureau is very decisive and outspoken:—

"Statistics prove, beyond doubt, that most fallen women have been compelled to their fall by poverty. The evident remedy is therefore the prevention of the impelling cause. Efforts in other directions, though eminently laudable, are but occasional, and can never eradicate the root of the wrong. . . . When woman shall be justly recompensed for her labour, with new and quickening inducements to enterprise, she will become the mistress and not continue the slave of her situation, and then confidently await the issue, whether it be that of the associated life for which she was created, or that of singly blessing her generation by the good words and good deeds of a pure and holy life. . . . We add this one thought more, that she should be at once endowed with her rightful political equality. These helps will do more towards purifying the social state and correcting the great social evils under which she suffers than years of legislation or volumes of statistics. The vilest man can further his villany at the ballot-box; the purest and noblest woman cannot protect her smallest right thereby. The tyranny that oppresses her is strengthened by her own disfranchisement, and makes her impotent to defend her own prerogatives."

We have lately had occasion to notice a short sketch of efforts made in Scotland to ameliorate the condition of the homes of the working classes by means of co-operative building societies. These plans are somewhat on the model of experiments held to have been successful in France, under the patronage of what was at that period the highest authority. When the late Emperor of France intimated his intention to exhibit model cottages in the Exhibition of 1867, the door was closed against any rival plans which might endanger his pre-eminent claims, and it was still more decidedly shut, says M. Godin,<sup>18</sup> against schemes which, by their completeness and by the unselfishness of their aims, must have utterly eclipsed them. So the Familistère at Guise remained comparatively unknown to fame. That this was a misfortune will be admitted by anyone who, either wading through, glancing and smiling at, or altogether omitting, the larger portion of the first half of this volume, reaches the painstaking and minute account of M. Godin's great achievement at Guise, which occupies the latter half. Beginning at ten years old to perplex himself with the way in which authority was used in the school to which he was sent, and only diverted from devoting himself to teaching (with a view to improving on existing methods) by an overwhelming sense that he was called to set some great example to the world in connexion with manual industry, M. Godin began at the age of eleven and a half to work in his father's workshop, and thence went to Paris, expecting to find the workmen there labouring and living on the most scientific principles. He found the hours of work to be from 5 A.M. to 8 P.M., and the miseries of the workman's life to be so great that his ambition was at once fired, and was fixed on remedying such a state of affairs. He started a new industry, that of making cast-iron instead of wrought-iron heating apparatus, and became an employer. He at once began to pay his workmen by the hour rather than by the day or portion of the day, looking forward to the time when a system of payment by the value of the work done might be introduced as a still further improvement, tending to do away with surveillance and to give free play to individual gifts. Then, finding much idleness and disorder to result from payments being made to all the *employés* on one day, he so arranged matters that it seldom happened that more than one workman in a room had his pockets full on the same day, and so temptations to "treating" were largely removed. The pecuniary penalties ordinarily imposed for absence, or for bad work, or for breaking some rule of the establishment, and ordinarily applied by the master or his subordinates to the relief of illness among the workmen, were placed under the control of a committee of the workmen themselves. These measures were taken as likely to palliate some glaring evils; but a full working out and a more practical completion than even Fourier sketched out of his own theories was floating before the eyes of his ardent disciple. Undismayed by the obloquy cast upon Socialistic theories in 1848, fortunately escaping the proscription by which his friends suffered, still not driven

---

<sup>18</sup> *"Solutions Sociales, par Godin, Membre de l'Assemblée Nationale." Paris 1871.*

to despair by "the 2nd of December." M. Godin hoped for the success of the Socialistic experiment in Texas in 1853, and embarked a third of his fortune in it. But the foreseeing its failure served only to turn his energies to the repair of his own fortunes and to the determination to attempt something on his native soil. In the various attempts made to improve the condition of workmen under the Empire M. Godin always detected the effort to keep supreme control over, instead of giving freedom and equal rights to, the working classes; and, having come to a definite conclusion that a great reform in architecture was the first thing needed to raise those classes from their state of servitude and misery, all the "*Casernes ouvrières*" and "*Cités ouvrières*" showed their hollow side to him. It will be found interesting to read his account and criticisms of *Grand Hornu*, *Mülhouse*, and the Collieries of the *Département du Nord*. In 1859 he founded the *Familistère* at Guise. Unable to assemble all the requisites for a perfect experiment, he determined that a scheme though started by one person should be so impersonal and unselfish in all its tendencies that the generation reared under its influence should itself be fit to carry on to completion. Accordingly, the vast Social Palace, with its separate sets of rooms, capable of infinite variety in area and in expense, but all alike furnished with perfect conveniences in matters of air, light, water, and regulated temperature, and all communicating with the public staircases and galleries; the economy of co-operative stores in one part of the buildings, of common medical aid, of gratuitous education for children, and of free apprenticeship; all the advantages of the *Crèche*; the baths and washhouses; the gardens, the covered ways and playgrounds—these are calculated not to redound to the profit of the founder and owner himself, but are entirely under the control of the society itself. To have a vote, the man or woman need only be either sixteen years of age or be self-supporting—on the principle of receiving the value of work done. The Supreme Councils, co-ordinate in power, sometimes associated in consultation, but more frequently sharing the work of government between them, consist of twelve men and twelve women. They regulate the police system of the whole establishment, decide on cases where it is necessary to expel members from the *Familistère*, and are the final Court of Appeal from the various committees which superintend the educational, sanitary, and other departments of social work. In an association which hopes more from the future than it expects from the present it is natural to find that no age is considered too young to bring the child under the care of the general public. Long before it can walk the child is protected from the evils arising from incompetence, carelessness, or too great occupation on its parents' part. The schools, where boys and girls are taught in the same rooms and in all respects alike, are most anxiously planned. To those who would take strong objection to the publicity of the life in such an establishment, from the cradle to the grave, perhaps a sufficient answer is given by pointing to the publicity of life in a manufacturing village or a crowded and filthy city street, where none of the counterbalancing advantages exist. To those who see other evils, or rather great chasms, in the scheme, arising from the want of some greater principle of asso-

ciation than that of physical and material well-being, it may suffice to remember that these material things have wanted doing, and that the advantages offered by the Familistère are compatible with any truly philanthropic and unselfish theory in existence.

The radical national differences between Germans and Englishmen perhaps show themselves seldom more strongly than when crystallized in the shape of books of travel. Instead of a series of more or less vivid sketches of personal experiences, Herr von Schlagintweit gives, under the unassuming title of "*Californien: Land und Leute*,"<sup>19</sup> an exhaustive summary of what may be said on these subjects, beginning with scientific speculations on the etymology of the name, and going on to give exact statistics of area, relative populations of the different districts, increase of population in proportion to other American States, education, commercial enterprises, and so forth. A minute account, drawn from personal observation and inquiry, as well as from all other available resources, of the mountain system, the hydrography, the vegetation, and the climate of California, contains gloomy prognostications as to the future of the country if forestry continues to be a neglected branch of the governmental duties. The most valuable trees are yearly wasted, and their fall and decay, together with consequent landslips, and fresh outbreaks of mountain torrents and bared rocks, threaten disastrous climatic changes. Of the climate as it is at present, and of the prospects of agriculture, Herr von Schlagintweit speaks with enthusiasm, specially noting the prosperity of vineyards and the fact that 1870 saw the first silk, cotton, and beetroot sugar exported from California. The Chinese settlers attracted much of his interest, and in the present day it is delightful to read his account of the "Six Great Societies" which receive the Chinese immigrant on his arrival; afford him protection, shelter, and advice while he remains in the country, under whatever conditions of service; and transmit either his savings while he lives, or his body when he dies, to his native land.

The primitive history of the whole genus of "sworn judicial tribunals," of which the English "trial by jury" is only a species, has long been considered as shrouded in that profound night of ignorance which envelops all those institutions which can with equal plausibility be attributed to the influences of Roman law, to the Catholic Church, or to the barbarian invasions. Dr. Heinrich Brunner<sup>20</sup> has done his best, in a most interesting and erudite treatise, to rescue from this shadowy region the institution of "*Schwurgerichte*," or sworn judicial tribunal. It is well known that English writers have much doubted whether the favourite national institution of "trial by jury" is of a purely local origin, or whether it is more probably derived from the Normans, or, indeed, from the Danes. Dr. H. Brunner also interposes a wise caution as to the danger of confounding different institutions because

<sup>19</sup> "*Californien: Land und Leute*." Von Robert von Schlagintweit. Köln und Leipzig. 1871.

<sup>20</sup> "*Die Entstehung der Schwurgerichte*." Von Dr. Heinrich Brunner. Berlin. 1872.

of a likeness in their name. Thus some writers have based the English jury on the Roman "Judices," and others on the representative tribunals of the canon law. Dr. Brunner enters upon a most searching investigation of every institution within the limits of the Germanic races (to which he thinks the inquiry may properly be confined) which recognises the machinery of referring questions civil, ecclesiastical, and criminal to a body of men sworn for the particular occasion. The "inquisitions" so familiar in early Norman times in England are instances of the sort of procedure then contemplated. This habit of making "inquisitions" seems to have become universal for all manner of purposes both in Church and State, and gradually was established on a permanent basis, of which the English jury seems only to have been an accidental offshoot.

It is scarcely possible to speak too highly of a work by Herr Carl Julius Bergius<sup>21</sup> on what he calls the "Science of Finance," with particular reference to the existing circumstance of the Prussian State. This work comprehends everything that can possibly be brought under its title, and a great deal more than most writers (especially English ones) would think it worth while to bring under it. Herr C. J. Bergius notices that the reform of economic science in Prussia is due to the efforts of Kraus and Hoffmann, of whom the former lived in Koenigsberg and was a colleague and friend of Kant. It was he who first distributed the whole subject into the department which deals with the enrichment of the people, and that which concerns the provision of the means of government or taxation. The latter, John Gottfried Hoffmann, born in Breslau, taught in Berlin from 1821 to 1835. The problems that lie before the State economist are propounded by Herr C. Julius Bergius in a long and exhaustive chapter, in the course of which accurate statistics are given as to the progressive increase of the population of the State of Prussia from 1816 to 1867; the number at the latter date being 19,815,206. The whole topics of Railways, Telegraphs, Land, and Coinage, in relation to taxation, and especially to that of Prussia, are handled with great particularity, and the opinions of Mr. Mill and Bastiat are cited as occasion requires. The questions of direct taxation by contrast with indirect, and of public debts, are carefully investigated in all their aspects.

The work of Herr Karl Thomas Richter, styled "An Introduction to the Study of Public Economy,"<sup>22</sup> represents a form of composition of which no examples exist in England. Indeed, the field of "Public economy," which is about midway between that of "Political economy" and general politics, has hardly been mapped out in this country, and the sort of moral and historical depths into which the continental writer descends with the utmost sense of familiarity, would daunt many of the most enterprising of English writers and readers. Thus Herr K. T. Richter commences his investigation by three chapters on the concep-

<sup>21</sup> "Grundsätze der Finanzwissenschaft mit besonderer Beziehung auf den Preussischen Staat." Von Carl Julius Bergius. Berlin, 1871.

<sup>22</sup> "Einleitung in das Studium der Volkswirtschaft." Von Karl Thomas Richter. Prag, 1871.



tion or idea (Begriff), the history, and the logical import of "Wirthschaft," or economical science. The first special matters of inquiry are into man as a being (Wesen), nature as a phenomenon, and man and nature in their relations to each other. The Family, Society, and the State are thus regarded as each contributing their quota towards the joint and final product. The result is tested by the actual political development of England, France, and Germany. It is curious to read the enthusiastic admiration of Owen, expressed as follows:—"The severely Socialistic direction has in the noble and philanthropic Owen not only a writer, but an honourable and courageous worker. The sound spirit of the people that has begotten so magnificent a theory and such magnanimous men as Fergusson and Owen, is ever passing onwards towards the common happiness."

The main epochs in the history of Bohemia are of such importance, in relation to the general development of the Eastern States of Europe, that an accurate survey of those epochs, such as that of Dr. Hugo Toman,<sup>23</sup> is a valuable contribution to political science. Dr. Toman commences his investigations at the year 1527, and endeavours to ascertain from many conflicting authorities what was the law of succession to the Bohemian Crown at that period. A most interesting part of the work is concerned with the reign and the reforms of Maria Theresa between 1740 and 1780. These reforms reached to almost every branch of the constitution and of government, and Dr. Toman gives a precise account of the changes made in the system of taxation, and in the organization of the executive department of government. The consequence of the brave struggle for the integrity of the Austrian dominions against the various assailants was naturally a great increase of centralization, which exhibited itself, among other things, in a system of civil and criminal procedure common to all the Austrian and Bohemian territories, and having its centre in Vienna. In 1758 instructions were given for the preparation of a "formal and material" civil and penal code. It was through this administrative unity that Dr. Toman conceives the notion of the essential political unity of Austria and Bohemia to have made its way. Dr. Toman goes on to investigate the further changes introduced by Joseph II., and brings down his narrative to what he describes as the culminating point of "Absolutism" in 1848.

The name of Hans Christian Andersen on a title-page gives unfailing promise of pleasure. In the volume before us,<sup>24</sup> consisting of travellers' sketches, two or three short biographies, and a child's history of Copenhagen, that last named carries the palm as displaying his most characteristic charm and playfulness. On the night before gas assumes the dominion of the streets of Copenhagen, the old oil-lamps give vent to their jealousies, and though spluttering with the thought that their now triumphant rivals will perhaps some day give place to some scheme for burning sea-water, they think it worth while

<sup>23</sup> "Das Böhmisches Staatsrecht und die Entwicklung der Österreichischen Reichsides vom Jahre 1527 bis 1848." Von Dr. Hugo Toman. Prag. 1872.

<sup>24</sup> "Reisebilder und Federzeichnungen." By H. C. Andersen. (Deutsch von Dr. A. W. Peters.) Braunsch. 1872.

to suggest to "Pathe" to make a "Bilderbuch" of the principal sights they and their ancestors have seen in Copenhagen, hoping that the gas-lamps, with all the advantages and disadvantages of association, as contrasted with their own individuality of character, will be able to give as good an account of Denmark when their last night comes. A warm and affectionate narrative of a long visit paid to Mr. Charles Dickens at Gadshill; a most sympathetic account of the Oberammergau Passion-play; the story of the Lion at Lucerne; and one or two other papers about Ragatz, about the island of Skagen, and about two young Danish artists, Hartmann the musician, and Ingemann the poet, complete the volume.

Herr Zingerle has devoted many years to the collection of legends, myths, and proverbs in the Tyrol, such as throw light upon the ancient heathen worship of the country. In this enlarged edition<sup>22</sup> of one of his works are presented the fruits of fourteen more years of search, divided under headings and so thoroughly indexed that no one can have difficulty in referring at once to any point on which he wishes to avail himself of Herr Zingerle's aid. The preface contains a number of questions, as suggestions to fellow-labourers in similar fields of inquiry, which would afford the necessary guidance to any one wishful to help in a comparative collection of European mythology. It is difficult to give selections from a work consisting of sentences chosen for their equal and independent interest. To each saying, or custom, or story, or superstition, is appended the name of the district where it is common. The following may serve as instances:—"If a child looks round the church during its baptism, it will be a priest" (Söll). "One must not cut the nails of little children, lest they should steal" (Ranggen). "He who finds the keyhole quickly, is in love" (near Innsbruck). "If maidens wish to marry, they must pet the cat and feed it well." "He who removes a boundary-stone, wanders along the boundary as a blazing ghost." "If the cows come home late in the evening, next day is bad weather" (Innthal, Pitzthal). Many nursery rhymes and conundrums complete the volume.

It is interesting to find a German professor of "State sciences" going the whole length of the most advanced English reformers in the direction of reconstituting the relations of men and women; indeed, by a singularly paradoxical process some *soi-disant* English reformers do not go half so far. Dr. H. von Scheel, in his little work on "Social Questions,"<sup>23</sup> points out that the situation of women, in an economical point of view, has for some years past been undergoing a conspicuous change for the worse. There is a smaller probability of marriage, there is a greater restriction of the field of work as compared with the general increase of employment, and there is a decrease of remuneration as compared with the general rise in the case of men. The author especially dwells on prostitution as an index to the depressed condition

<sup>22</sup> "Sitten, Bräutche, und Meinungen des Tiroler Volkes." Von Ignaz von Zingerle. Innsbruck. 1871.

<sup>23</sup> "Die Theorie der Sozialen Frage." Von Dr. Hugo von Scheel. Jena. 1871.

of women, and resents the notion of disgracefully organizing it as a necessary element in modern society, instead of courageously redressing the evils to which it is due.

An useful but whimsically written book, styled "The Confessions of an Old Almsgiver,"<sup>27</sup> portrays the absurd anomalies arising from an indiscriminate system of almsgiving, or even of administering relief by district visiting societies and by charitable societies not harmoniously co-operating with each other. The real evils attempted to be remedied by charity organization societies are described with vividness and accuracy, though the style is "far from being after the writer's present tastes," nor, probably, after those of most of his readers.

Those who are acquainted with the practical and literary contributions to the cause of education made by Mr. Sonnenschein will study with the greatest interest a pamphlet of his of a most unpretending sort (as compared with its intrinsic merits) on the subject of "School Boards and Board Schools."<sup>28</sup> The little work is so compressed and crammed with matter that it does not admit of even cursory analysis. There is scarcely a topic on which he does not touch, and do his utmost to dispel popular illusions and ignorant prejudices. The main heads are Methods of School-keeping, Structure of School-rooms and Furniture, Discipline, School Books, Aims and Methods of Teaching, and the Training and Appointment of Teachers and Inspectors and Examiners. A main maxim of Mr. Sonnenschein's is "*one teacher to one class in one room.*" Another maxim is "*one trained teacher in one properly furnished room for one class of pupils at one stage.*"

---

## SCIENCE.

**M.** SCHORLEMMER, who some time ago published a German edition of the well-known and comprehensive little text-book on chemistry by Professor Roscoe, has now written as a continuation and second part of it, a work on the chemistry of carbon compounds.<sup>1</sup> The book is certainly not without such merits as might be expected from an experienced practical teacher and an original inquirer well acquainted with the modern progress of the science. But students and teachers will in vain search for that compactness and even freshness of arrangement and exposition of facts which have rendered Professor Roscoe's text-book so acceptable to them. There is an absence of originality in M. Schorlemmer's book which will cause much disappointment to his readers; the work possesses no striking

---

<sup>27</sup> "The Confessions of an Old Almsgiver." London; William Hunt. 1871.

<sup>28</sup> "School Boards and Board Schools: Practical Suggestions." By A. Sonnenschein. Williams and Norgate. 1871.

<sup>1</sup> "Lehrbuch der Kohlenstoffverbindungen." Von Carl Schorlemmer. Braunschweig: Vieweg und Sohn. 1871. London; Nutt.

feature which distinguishes it from any other text-book of similar aim and extent. The introductory portion is in our opinion far too condensed and will do little to remove the difficulties which the student of organic chemistry has to encounter in the beginning of his studies. We fully admit that long theoretical introductions are out of place, unless a sound knowledge of the most prominent facts of chemistry has already been obtained by the reader by a previous course of study. The author has therefore preferred, and we think very wisely, to intersperse the history of the compounds here and there with generalizing statements and references to certain theories of the constitution of bodies. In this respect the book will afford valuable help to the student, but we cannot help pointing out here, that unless a chemical text-book includes, and presents at the outset, a thoroughly rational classification of the various *processes* of chemistry, we do not mean compounds, which the present state of the science already permits in a high degree, neither sound study of the science nor discovery of great generalizations will make much progress. As the facts of the science are now presented by every writer, and M. Schorlemmer has not even made an attempt to leave the beaten track, students have simply to learn by heart what they are told of the reaction of various bodies upon every compound which is described, and have to take it upon good faith, for it is almost impossible for any one to test the accuracy of the statements thus presented to him by actual experiment; a comprehensively classified arrangement of organic compounds according to their behaviour to one and the same reagent has not yet been thought of by any writer, although the materials for such an arrangement are scattered in every work on chemistry and left for the student to be collected after years of bewilderment. M. Schorlemmer's book is however characterized by one great merit: it is not weighted by those superfluous descriptions of numerous bodies which no one ever sees either in the laboratory or elsewhere, and which the author with great tact has banished into the place where alone they are properly described—viz., the chemical dictionaries. The work will thus enable the student to obtain a general outline of the science without overloading his memory.

M. Gorup-Besanez appears to belong to that fortunately limited number of chemists who only very reluctantly give way before the encroachment of modern chemical speculation upon their cherished grounds.<sup>2</sup> His text-books are written and arranged with singular clearness, and possess the additional advantage of being at the same time practical guides to the laboratory; very excellent directions for chemical manipulation generally, and for producing the various elements and their combinations, being given in smaller type at the end of each chapter. Hence the author's text-books have passed through various editions, and have also in this country been in many hands, but unless he forgets and learns, we fear there will be a speedy decadence of his valuable contributions to scientific literature. Professor Gorup-

<sup>2</sup> "Lehrbuch der Chemie." Von Dr. E. F. v. Gorup-Besanez. Braunschweig: Vieweg und Sohn. London: Nutt.

Besanez gives, from what appears almost supineness or obstinacy on his part, the strange explanation that the modern chemical theories aim principally at throwing light upon the constitution of bodies, and that this is far too difficult a subject for students who only begin their acquaintance with the science. Hence he maintains the old notation and formulæ in their integrity, but being unable to overlook the claims of molecular theories, he introduces here and there statements founded upon them, and involves in our opinion the beginner in increased difficulties. The mere molecular notation is learned as easily by beginners as the old one, and prepares for him a sure way into a precise apprehension of modern doctrines, without being hampered with facts which have been merely the stepping-stones to progress. It is certainly not usual in text-books on physics, geology, or mathematics to introduce incorrect views, obsolete notations, and transitional methods, because the more modern way of treatment is too difficult. If every one who enters upon the study of a branch of knowledge should have to work his way first through all that has preceded the present state, no progress could ever be made; the author's view of the requirements of a text-book are therefore decidedly erroneous.

Of the well-known admirable text-book by Professor Wohler, a new edition has been prepared by Professor Fittig.<sup>3</sup> We do not know any chemical text-book which is a mere outline of the principal facts, and which is intended as a note-book for lectures, that is so compendious and well arranged as is Professor Wöhler's. It gives exactly what is most important in the history of every compound, and would in our opinion, in an English translation, be a most valuable book of reference to the practical chemist and the chemical philosopher in this country.

Among our English text-books on chemistry, that by the late Professor Wilson,<sup>4</sup> now edited by Mr. Madan, deserves a prominent place. It is a fact only too well known to teachers of chemistry, that most of the extant treatises on the science are either too extensive in their aim, too bulky and too costly, or too advanced in their mode of treatment, and too compendious to be of real advantage to the large class of students who are anxious to acquire some knowledge of a branch of learning of which few can at the present day afford to be altogether ignorant. Although therefore the object of this work is strictly elementary, still there is an amount of facts, practical and theoretical, to be met with in its pages, which will amply repay a perusal even by advanced readers. An introduction to the knowledge of the more important fundamental laws of chemistry, and the properties of the chief elementary substances, with their more remarkable compounds, forms the foreground of what may be learned, but great attention is also devoted to the discussion of the general properties of matter,

<sup>3</sup> "Wöhler's *Grundriss der Organischen Chemie*." Von Dr. Rudolph Fittig. Leipzig: Duncker and Humblot. 1872. London: Nutt.

<sup>4</sup> "Inorganic Chemistry." By the late George Wilson, M.D., Professor of Technology in the University of Edinburgh. Revised and Enlarged by H. G. Madan, M.A., Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. London: W. & R. Chambers. 1871.

chemical affinity, the atomic theory, and even to the chemical relations of heat and electricity. The author has well perceived that a student of the science is wronged if he is not made familiar from the outset with chemical symbols, the absence of which, or the exchange of which for verbal explanations, would render the higher portions of chemistry utterly perplexing; great importance is hence justly given to chemical notation. The work in its present state, enriched as it is by Mr. Madan's extensions in matter and alterations in the symbolic language, is admirably adapted to supply the want of a very large class of readers.

The want of a good scientific primer is acknowledged, and the difficulties of producing such a work are certainly appreciated best by those who are most capable of writing such a book. That these difficulties are almost insurmountable is best shown by Mr. Constable's scientific "Reading Book." Its aim is not to give formal courses of instruction in various departments of science, but to afford the means of cultivating the opening mind of youth, and at the same time to give a certain completeness and firmness to previous acquirements by introducing, in a new and fresh form, subjects partially handled in earlier lessons. The treatment is designedly free from technicalities, with the exception of human physiology and botany, because in these departments it is indeed impossible to advance beyond the vaguest and most elementary statements without the adoption of technical language. Praiseworthy as aim and treatment undoubtedly are, we think that the former is hardly reached, nor the latter as carried through the work best adapted to its purpose. If scientific facts do not in themselves rouse genuine interest in learners, provided that they are expounded in a clear, well-chosen language, no amount of artificial "attractive method" will lead to useful information. Such an attempt as is presented here, to give superficial glances at various departments of science, cannot but be a failure in the end. Boys and girls of average intellect can very well understand a chapter on the processes of digestion, on the various phenomena of refraction, on the organs of a flower, on the nature and laws of wages, and so on, without the usual amount of unnecessary verbosity, from which Mr. Constable's book, like most other works of the same kind, is not entirely free. What necessity is there in such books for sentences like these:—"If time permitted, I should like very much to talk to you about the eye, and to explain to you the manner in which it acts upon light" (page 57)? Or, "I want to engage you boys on a new subject. I want you to begin the study of social economy, a branch of social science," &c. &c. (page 142)? Such sentences are unnecessary, and if the whole of those we have noticed were collected they would fill a considerable space which might be better filled with genuine information. We maintain, that in all such primers no attempt should ever be made to give a kind of complete survey of any department of science, but that distinct subjects, which are comparatively well established, and have left behind the stage of scientific controversy, should be explained thoroughly in their complete bearings.

The third part of Professor Everett's English edition of M. Privat Deschanel's *Physica* is devoted to electricity and magnetism.<sup>6</sup> We have already on the appearance of the first two parts of the work discussed some of its merits, and pointed to some features which in our opinion detracted, although in a slight degree, from the measure of praise which this work, and especially the English edition of it, undoubtedly deserves. In this portion, Professor Everett has considerably supplemented by his own labours the material supplied by the French author. The accurate method of treating electrical subjects which has been established in this country by Sir William Thomson and others, has not only not yet been adopted in France, but some of Faraday's electro-magnetic work appears to be still very imperfectly appreciated by French writers. The additions introduced by the English editor, now make the work very complete as far as electricity is concerned. Magnetism has here again met with the usual neglect. The author's selection of his sources of information on this subject appears not to have been a very happy one.

That there is no necessity for treating magnetism in so brief a manner as Professor Everett has done, through any want of important material, is best shown by the modest but excellent treatise, originally written by the late Sir Snow Harris, and now edited, and considerably enlarged by recent researches, by Mr. Noad.<sup>7</sup> The author possesses that happy gift of teaching, by which alone, especially in a science based on induction, sound knowledge can be imparted. He sets out with simple experiments, which presuppose no knowledge whatever, and leads the experimenter by means of the consequences and conclusions at which he arrives, gradually to the more remote general laws and deductive applications of the facts established. Taking the term "magnetism" in its most general acceptation, the author places the reader in the first instance, in possession of such elementary knowledge as bears directly on that species of force, peculiar to ferruginous matter, by which one particle of iron is observed to attract another particle at very sensible distances, but without entering further into the combined sciences of electricity and magnetism than may be requisite to an adequate exposition of well-established facts. With this is combined a general history of the subject, considered as a distinct branch of physics. Then follows a description of various magnetical instruments and manipulations, and finally, the knowledge thus acquired is applied to a more extended investigation of the great natural phenomena presented to us in the magnetic action of the earth, and to elucidations of a practical kind. Mr. Noad has added with great tact and perspicacity an account of various new acquisitions to the science, especially of those resulting from Faraday's latest researches on magnetism, and of the recent important investigations by the Astronomer

---

\* "Elementary Treatise on Natural Philosophy." By A. Privat Deschanel. Translated and edited by J. D. Everett, Professor of Natural Philosophy in the Queen's College, Belfast. Part III. Electricity and Magnetism. London: Blackie & Son. 1872.

† "Radiant Magnetism." By Sir W. Snow Harris. Revised and Enlarged by Henry M. Noad, Ph.D. London: Lockwood & Co. 1872.

Royal, as well as of others, respecting the deviations of the compass in iron ships. The succinct description of the progress of our knowledge of terrestrial magnetism during the last twenty years, which the editor has added, bears witness to the extent of his research and the wide range of information.

Of the several treatises on the Microscope with which we are acquainted, that by Professor Frey appears to us the most thoroughly practical and scientific.<sup>2</sup> Its especial merit lies in confining its aim to purely physiological researches, relating to the human body in the healthy and diseased state of its histological elements and organs. The introduction, which gives a short account of the history, literature, and importance of the subject, is followed by chapters which give much more than the mere outlines found even in the best treatises on such important parts as the general theory of the instrument; the various apparatus for making measurements and drawings; the binocular, stereoscopic, and polarization microscope; and finally, the methods of examining the instrument with a view to a correct judgment on its capabilities and value. The full description of the various elements of the tissues, as they appear in normal or anomalous conditions when viewed under magnifying power, is preceded by a thoroughly clear and practical instruction for using the microscope, and the various methods of preparing objects of every kind. Every portion of the subject is treated with obviously not merely theoretical knowledge, but in a manner which testifies that every statement is the result of actual experience. Professor Frey's work is throughout a most valuable addition to scientific literature, and will take a high position among students and practical inquirers. The most recent improvements are embodied in the text; and the merits of English observers, their contributions to the various subjects, and the additions made by English opticians to the instrumental parts of microscopic science, are treated with that impartial appreciation characteristic of German writers.

Mr. Butler's "Atlas of Modern Geography"<sup>3</sup> must unhesitatingly be pronounced one of the best collections of maps for the purpose of general geographical information which has come under our notice. Its great superiority lies principally in the fact that that great shortcoming of most maps, the unnecessary and excessive minuteness of detail, is throughout avoided in these, and thereby a clearness and distinctness in each of them is obtained, which gives great satisfaction. The physical features are everywhere pictured, by a proper arrangement of scale for each map, with an admirable perspicuity, which has been further aimed at by reducing the number of the names of towns and cities which are given to such only as are of real importance. It is by no means a matter of little import that this Atlas has been published at a price which will bring it within reach of the humblest student.

\* "Das Microscop und die Microscopische Technik." Von Dr. Heinrich Frey, Professor der Medizin in Zürich. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann. 1871. London: Nutt.

\* "The Public School Atlas of Modern Geography, in 31 Maps." Edited by the Rev. George Butler. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1872.



Mr. Bryce's Atlas is intended rather to represent the various physical aspects of the globe than to describe purely geographical facts.<sup>10</sup> Its maps are preceded by about eighty pages of letterpress, which are written with great ability, and indeed form quite a valuable manual of the physical geography of the earth. Several of the maps, especially those giving sections through continents and certain countries, will contribute very much to spread really sound information on the configuration of the earth's surface. A few similar geological sections might well have been added, and would have served to render clearer the solitary geological map which is given. To students, geological maps without sections are hardly of any value.

The treatise on viticulture and wine,<sup>11</sup> by Messrs. Thudichum and Dupré, is in the strictest sense of the word a scientific work, based upon observations in vineyards, cellars, and repositories of many countries, and upon researches in the chemical laboratory. Having founded their work upon vast personal investigations, as well as upon the sources of information supplied by the writings of previous authors, Messrs. Thudichum and Dupré have produced a work which for completeness, exhaustiveness of the subject in its various aspects, sagacious discrimination, and arrangement of the material, stands unrivalled in the literature of any country, and will probably remain for a long time to come the most valuable treatise and source of information on the subject. The wine-growers of our colonies as well as of other countries where viticulture and vinification are often during a long period passing through stages of empirical growth and development, of attempts and failures, will find in this work a concise exposition of the practical and scientific principles on which oenology rests, and by the aid of them they may attain the best products of which their climate may admit. But the authors present by the side of these general principles, also faithful and vivid pictures of the viticulture of the principal wine districts of the world, which they may use as patterns for imitation, if disinclined to rely upon general principles. It is probably this view of their aim, and the best method for affording the best possible advantages to be derived from their work, which has induced the authors to give great prominence to the description of districts where viticulture has reached a high degree of perfection, and to treat with comparative neglect certain countries which they did not deem worthy of more than a passing consideration. The planters of Australia and South Africa will therefore in some measure feel inclined to complain of the authors; and there is no doubt that we should have been glad if more attention had been given to a discussion of the well-known viticultural peculiarities introduced by the Cape of Good Hope growers, and to a more extended exposition of the real capabilities of the Australian wines, on which subject opinions of so high authorities as the authors of this treatise would have been

<sup>10</sup> "The Student's Atlas of Physical Geography, consisting of 20 maps, with descriptive letterpress." By James Bryce, F.R.G.S. London: Collins, Son, and Co. 1871.

<sup>11</sup> "A Treatise on the Origin, Nature, and Varieties of Wine." By J. L. W. Thudichum, M.D., and Auguste Dupré, Ph.D. London: Macmillan & Co. 1872.

of the greatest value. The authors have, however, preferred to extend more the commercial view of the question, and to give everywhere topographical and statistical information such as may aid materially in enlarging the field of mercantile intercourse in wines among nations. They have been guided here, it seems, by a desire to further, as far as possible, the benevolent intentions of the Legislature of this country—namely, to make accessible to the people at large the wines of all countries which can be used as beverages, and which by the voice of science and the practice of whole nations are declared preferable by far to distilled spirits, or to wines fortified by such. But it must be conceded, that while we are perhaps doubting the importance of this question—at least when compared with the other to which we have alluded—the authors have certainly abstained from a zealous exaggeration, and have succeeded in preserving that judicial calmness in every expression of opinion which distinguishes the historian of nature.

Mr. Merrifield's "Technical Arithmetic and Mensuration"<sup>12</sup> is one of a series of excellent text-books on scientific subjects published by Messrs. Longman & Co. A better and clearer treatment of this department of knowledge we have rarely seen. The author has vigorously freed himself from the so-called logical sequence in the usual arrangement of the subject. He says very justly, "There is not much practical connexion between successful teaching and logical sequence. The province of logic is to test ideas, not to impart them." He has divided the subject of fractions into two parts, of which the first precedes Proportion and Practice, and the second including the Greatest Common Measure, follows these rules. From this arrangement the great practical advantage follows, that the learner is able to turn even an incomplete portion of his knowledge to good account. The work is further distinguished from the usual form of such treatises by various novelties of great usefulness. There is a chapter on the application of arithmetic to machines, work, and motion, which explains in a very lucid and concise manner the principles on which the power and useful effect of machines is calculated. The aim throughout this really excellent text-book has been a practical one; to the attentive reader this will appear not only in the method of the author, but still more so in the illustrations, examples, and problems, which are selected with the utmost care, and with a constant view to imparting general instruction.

Mr. Morgan is one of the Fellows of the University of Cambridge who some time ago strongly opposed the extensions of the Tripos course in Mathematics which had then been introduced.<sup>13</sup> He has now given expression to his views, and proves that the present course of study, as prescribed by the University authorities, may make good wranglers, but fails in giving that kind of education which is the primary object of universities. We may assure Mr. Morgan that he

<sup>12</sup> Technical Arithmetic and Mensuration. By Charles W. Merrifield, F.R.S. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1872.

<sup>13</sup> The Mathematical Tripos; an Inquiry into its influence on a liberal education. By the Rev. H. A. Morgan, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Jesus College, Cambridge. London: Rivingtons. 1871.

has with him the opinion of every enlightened man in this country who is competent to form an opinion on the subject. The Cambridge mathematical course, far from contributing to strengthen the mental powers of the youths who have to pass through it—far from educating thoroughly valuable men for the various higher walks of life, has long been recognised by many as a mere engine of cram and unworthy competition, and as not even producing good mathematicians or genuine students and inquirers in science. As Mr. Morgan himself appears to think, the few distinguished men which Cambridge boasts of are hardly to be considered as proving the value of the methods pursued at the university. Indeed we think that there must, among thousands of young vigorous men, be some whom even a Cambridge forcing career cannot absolutely deprive of their powers; but they are exceptions, as a brilliant hothouse plant will not always collapse after being withdrawn from the artificial conditions which produced its luxuriant growth, but will sometimes, although rarely, continue to exist and flower even more vigorously in the natural atmosphere.

To English mathematical students we should like to recommend M. Hattendorff's compact but pregnant little work on *Analytical Geometry*.<sup>14</sup> Its methods are everywhere most elegant, without that verbosity which disfigures so many of our works on the same subject, and its contents are as extensive as the most voluminous manual. Although its author presents it as an introduction to the subject, we believe that a short previous course in a more elementary manual will prove a good preparation for its study. As usual in continental works of this kind, half the work is not filled with problems copied from University papers, and unintelligible to the majority of students, but good sound matter is given throughout, with the view of teaching, not of perplexing and disheartening, the student.

There could be no better proof of the merit of Dr. Aitken's volumes<sup>15</sup> than the call for the sixth edition within so short a period as sixteen years, and we may unreservedly accept the author's assurance that he has conscientiously endeavoured to make each edition an improvement on its predecessor.

It is highly creditable to Dr. Aitken that he has resisted the temptation to reprint the volumes which are in so great demand with a few colourable alterations—a manœuvre which is but too often resorted to in such cases. Far from following such a course, Dr. Aitken has determined that the confidence placed in him by the public shall be amply justified. The work has now been to a great extent rewritten and entirely new sections have been added; not only so, but the whole has been recast in accordance with the new classification of the College of Physicians—a labour which no one who is accustomed to literary rearrangements will undervalue. It is therefore no exaggeration to say that the two cumbrous volumes before us do fairly represent the facts and opinions, the discoveries and the individual experience of

<sup>14</sup> "*Einleitung in die analytische Geometrie.*" Von K. Hattendorff. Hanover: Schöner und von Seefeld.

<sup>15</sup> "*The Science and Practice of Medicine.*" By William Aitken, M.D. 2 vols. 8vo. Sixth Edition. London: Griffin.

modern medicine. To have attempted to produce a work of such comprehensive value is in itself an honourable aim, to have succeeded is really a triumph. At the commencement of many of the several sections into which his work is divided Dr. Aitken has prefixed a chapter of general considerations which seem to us to be very well done and of great value. Indeed, at the outset of all, the author has brought his chapter on General Pathology up to the standard of the best recent observers.

On reading this introductory matter there are some statements which challenge question, but the very fact of their stimulating us to serious argument is, for the present, evidence enough of their seriousness and of their adequacy. So it is again with the matter introductory to the section on Fevers, where, if we ourselves are tempted to differ from the author in some detail, we nevertheless think, as a writer for students, he has succeeded well in putting forth new and difficult problems in a way which sets forth what is substantial in them without entering into the bewilderment of too much doubt and speculation. Among the points of especial interest we could refer the reader to the chapter on Cholera. We cannot but regard this as a substantial addition to our literature, for treatises on cholera, many of which are very important, have become so numerous and so widely scattered that a comprehensive survey of the whole question from one so well qualified to pronounce upon it as Dr. Aitken, is really a great gain not only to the student but also to the more advanced inquirer. We regret to have to say that little is added to our hopes in the matter of treatment, and we are rather surprised to find no notice for or against the mode of treatment recommended by Dr. Chapman. The whole section on zymotic diseases is very good and adequate in its main features, and if we miss certain points for which we had looked, we must remember, on the other hand, how difficult it must be in a book like the present to draw a line between the essential and the unessential parts of a subject—between the necessities of a subject, so to speak, and the luxuries. The former should all be included in a text-book, the latter find their place rather in such encyclopædic volumes as Reynolds's System of Medicine. We have much pleasure in giving a hearty and almost unqualified recommendation of this text-book to the profession.

The present volume completes the handsome library edition which has been issued by the Messrs. Black, of the collected works of the eminent teacher, Sir James Simpson.<sup>16</sup> The greater number of these lectures appeared in the *Medical Times and Gazette* during the years 1859, 1861, and in 1866. Ten of them, however, now appear for the first time. It is a luxury to a reviewer to turn over the pages of such a volume as this: the type and paper are clear and pleasant to the eye without being pretentious, and the book is freely illustrated by well executed and intelligible woodcuts. But it is in the matter rather than in the printing of it that we find an especial pleasure; the easy style, the

---

<sup>16</sup> "The Diseases of Women." By Sir James Y. Simpson, Bart., M.D. Edited by Alex. R. Simpson, M.D. Edinburgh: A. & C. Black. 8vo, pp. 789.

well-stored memory, and quick and fertile apprehension of the master carrying the reader along with absorbing interest. If any of us had been disposed to suffer some little reaction of feeling, after the great renown which Simpson enjoyed during his best years, and to wonder whether after all he was not a somewhat overrated man, such an one will probably be brought back to his former loyalty by a perusal of these pages. The cause of their success and of their charm lies no doubt in this, that Simpson's whole bent, and the force of his genius, lay in his earnest humanity. It is impossible to read such records of his teaching as the present, without seeing that the one thing which possessed the speaker, the one desire which fanned the flame of his wonderful energy, was to save or to help the afflicted. We urge, this point of view the more strongly because it impresses us just now in a peculiar way after reading these collected works, because it is so highly honourable to the great physician himself, and because it is so great an example to us who follow him. A detailed exposition or criticism of the volume before us is of course impossible in this place, nor is quotation from it even possible to us; and we would therefore prefer, in such space as we have, to indicate to our readers this general impression which we have received from the work as a whole. Books multiply upon our table, which may show, as those of our German brethren do often show, more minute accuracy in scientific detail, or more minute descriptions of disease in all its windings and changes; but we venture to say with something like just pride, that Simpson's lectures—which never fail to keep a single eye to the one chief aim of the true physician, and which display the efforts of his remarkable ingenuity directed always towards some farther development of the means of cure—we venture to say, commemorate, not only the distinction of Simpson himself, but also the distinction of the British School of Medicine, which found in him one of its highest examples. We do not wish to deal out indiscriminate praise: we are well aware that Sir James Simpson had faults of which it would be easy to speak with harshness, but we have to remember, and to remember with pride, that his unresting energy owed its vitality to a noble inspiration, which impelled him to leave no principle undeveloped, no means and no device unsought by which human suffering could be cured or allayed. And he will have his greatest reward in this, that among those who suffer, his name will never be forgotten. In turning over the present chapters, we cannot therefore but learn a valuable lesson from them. We do not find an elaborate section on causation, a second still more elaborate on pathological anatomy, a third on symptoms and refinement of diagnosis, and the whole closed by a few routine and chiefly negative words under the head of treatment; but we find that all the acute observation of the author, which under the former heads is by no means deficient, is however constantly turned towards the absorbing end of cure or relief. This, we contend, should be the character of all medical writing. When we come moreover to those paragraphs which are especially and avowedly devoted to treatment, we are not paid off with a few trimming sentences about the impropriety of excessive bleedings, the recent disuse of mercurials, and the untrustworthy character of such and such

vaunted remedies, and ending with so poor a residuum of therapeutics that the student begins to wonder why a patient should send for a doctor at all; but we find page after page filled with evidence of the most ingenious effort and fertile resource, leaving no chance of help unexplored, no fresh adaptation of old means, and no search after new ones, overlooked in the hearty, kindly endeavour to beat off the disease, which is only studied in order that it may be defeated. Hence there is little doubt that Simpson was especially fortunate as a practitioner, and that he earned his great reputation by genuine success in devising the means of curing his patients. This volume is full of such practical instruction, and we heartily commend it to the profession—not only for this which it actually contains, but as an example to others to go and do likewise.

The beautiful volumes of Reports already published by the War Department of the United States<sup>17</sup> are well known to our readers, and reflect the highest credit on the far-sighted policy which encourages and provides for their appearance. These records must not only be of great value to the medical officers of the army for their intrinsic merits, but must elevate the whole tone of the service in so far as they honour and commemorate the labours of its members. It is a pleasant stimulus to careful note-taking to be conscious that an interesting case well observed may receive the distinction of such beautiful type, paper, and illustrative woodcuts as the present. This "Circular No. 3," reports the chief surgical cases, those pertaining to operative surgery more especially, which have been observed in the army during the five years 1866-1871. The notes of the large number of cases are concise and not overladen with comment.

Gunshot wounds occupy the first eighty-eight pages of the book, the last two of which are devoted to an analytical review of the whole number of cases; then follow a few pages devoted to incised, punctured, poisoned wounds, &c.; then come fractures and dislocations; and after these, ten pages of cases of wounds by arrows, which have interested ourselves especially, as such classical wounds are rarely met with in modern Europe. In several of these cases the arrows penetrated the skull, and in one of them the iron head, far imbedded in the brain, was removed with temporary success, but unfortunately bad symptoms set in again after a week or ten days, and death ensued. The remainder of the 290 pages is occupied by accounts of operations. Three cases of lightning-stroke are also given, two of which were not followed by any serious consequences; the third patient however, a man of sixty, died on the third day. His horse had been killed on the spot, but no wound was discoverable; the rider was found insensible by his side. There was a superficial wound of the scalp, as if made by a sharp instrument, and a chain of vesications extending from below the right ear down the neck, chest, and abdomen. His clothing, the hat in particular, was rent and in places burnt. The symptoms were insensibility, restlessness, small pulse, and cold extremities; but little

---

<sup>17</sup> "A Report of Surgical Cases, being Circular No. 3 of the War Department of the United States." Washington. 1871.

reaction occurred. At the autopsy, eight hours after death, there was complete rigor mortis; the brain was found penetrated, and the portion of it which lay under the scalp wound was broken up and mixed with blood. There was no obvious fracture. The other viscera were healthy. The horse seems not to have been examined. With regard to the cases of gunshot wound, there is a curious opposition of experience—namely, that in wounds of the head, operative interference seems to have been little resorted to, and the general practice, in which we heartily concur, was evidently against it, save to remove spiculæ; on the other hand, the tendency in abdominal wounds was rather in favour of exploration, the practice of giving opium and making the patient comfortable being compendiously termed the “ostrich plan.” Among the operations we find ligation of the abdominal aorta for aneurism; unfortunately the sac was very thin, and was ruptured, although most carefully handled. The temperature never rose above 96°, and the patient died in eleven hours after the operation. The external iliac was tied three times with one recovery; the right common carotid was also successfully tied for secondary hæmorrhage. Excision of the hip was practised three times, and twice with gratifying success; temperature charts are given, and full page lithographic pictures of the patients after recovery. There is also a full page illustration of a case of successful re-amputation at the hip-joint. We have said enough to show that this interesting volume will be found full of value by many readers outside the department for the benefit of which it is first intended.

We are glad that the profession has shown a preference for Dr. Ringer's useful handbook,<sup>18</sup> and that the author has been thus enabled to give us an improved edition of it. We are the more pleased as the first edition, amid its many merits, presented scattered defects, such as careless correction of proofs, which detracted unduly from its value. Dr. Ringer still holds to his former plan of arrangement, which can scarcely be called a classification, and we are disposed to agree with his choice; on the one hand an alphabetical plan would have led to some repetition, and the principles for any scientific classification can scarcely be said as yet to exist. For this reason we think the indexes at the end should be made as complete as possible. We presume that myelitis, locomotor ataxy, alopecia—we mention the first names which occur to us—have their remedies, and that Dr. Ringer discusses them, but no reference to them is to be found in the index. For alopecia in particular we were in search of a new remedy, and were disappointed not to be able to turn to the matter at once. Favus, on the other hand, does enjoy a place to itself. But the gravest defect—and here we cannot but think we speak of a serious omission—is the absence of any allusion to electricity, now perhaps the most potent single remedy in the hands of the profession. As Dr. Ringer entitles his work a handbook, not of drugs, but of therapeutics, we have a right to express our regret that he has not seen fit to set forth those main features of electro-therapeutics which are now laid down with at

---

<sup>18</sup> “A Handbook of Therapeutics.” By Sidney Ringer, M.D. Second Edition. London: Lewis. 1871.

least as much certainty as are the methods of any other branch of the healing art. But we are surprised to find ourselves blaming where we had intended only to praise; we hasten to add that these remarks are dictated only by our desire to see Dr. Ringer's book supplying adequately the great need which we all feel for some standard authority on therapeutics. In great measure it now comes up to this standard; few paragraphs can be said to be inadequate, while page after page is full of interesting, novel, and practical teaching.

Dr. Legg's very pleasing little volume, pleasing in its matter as in its appearance,<sup>19</sup> belongs to the class of monographs, and is an excellent specimen of what a good monograph should be. The great objects of such a treatise should be twain; first, and perhaps chiefly, to sum up in a readable and accurate way all that has been said by former writers on the special matter in hand; secondly, to add some substantially valuable teaching from the experience and thoughtfulness of the writer himself. We are sorry to have to say that we rarely see a monograph which on the first of these pleas can put forward so good claim to its own existence as this by Dr. Legg. The literature of the subject has been carefully studied and compiled, and the volume concludes with one of those bibliographical indexes which are so especially welcome to the student, and which in England are daily becoming more and more rare. Such a work is at once a mark of the careful scholar and of the industry with which he has investigated the subject on which he writes. The subject of hæmophilia is one which has had especial interest for ourselves, on account of several remarkable cases which have come under our own care. We are therefore able to turn to some manuscript notes on the subject made a few years ago, and while we there find several references mentioned by Dr. Legg and overlooked by ourselves, we can offer him some token of our gratitude on our own side by referring him to two more essays on the subject, both published at Berlin in 1863; the one by Gerken and the other by Winkler. Dr. Legg rightly distinguishes hæmophilia as a permanent hæmorrhagic tendency, hereditary or congenital, having no definite cause, appearing in youth, persisting throughout the whole or a great part of life, and having a preference for certain districts, in virtue no doubt of its hereditary character. Dr. Legg holds the view which we ourselves strongly support—namely, that the disease lies not in the blood but in the structure or innervation of the vessels themselves. We would add that this view is supported by investigation of the state of the vessels in such diseases as scurvy, leucocythemia, and the like, in which the hæmorrhages have been too readily attributed to the "state of the blood."

Dr. Legg's publisher has also forwarded to us a neat little class-book<sup>20</sup> in which this physician sets forth briefly and clearly the modes of examining the urine and the clinical inferences to be drawn therefrom. The guide is accurate, conveniently arranged and practical in its

<sup>19</sup> "A Treatise on Hæmophilia." By J. Wickham Legg, M.D. London: Lewis.

<sup>20</sup> "A Guide to the Examination of the Urine." By J. Wickham Legg, M.D. London: Lewis.



aim; it does not pretend to any novelty, and does therefore not call for any further criticism in this place.

Dr. Baer's volume is one of those useful books which have frequently appeared from the hands of our German confrères—such, for example, as the “*Einrichtung und Verwaltung der Krankenhäuser*” of Esse. The present work,<sup>21</sup> devoted to the study of the hygiene of prisons, forms a fitting conclusion to the treatises which set forth the same requirements for those gathered together in schools, barracks, manufactories, hospitals, and asylums, and marks in the most gratifying way the enormous strides which real philanthropy, as well as sham philanthropy, has made since the not far distant time (or age shall we call it?) of Howard. We wish it could not be forgotten that societies are not fortuitous conglomerations, but organic wholes, and that as criminals form an integral part of most societies, we in protecting their health are but taking farther means for our own security. The author very properly divides the causes of prison sickness into those which are accidental and remediable, and those which are, or seem to be, inseparable from that state of existence. Among the former come the influences exerted by the site of the prison and the soil on which it is built, by overcrowding, filth, bad food, bad drainage, and so forth; while among the latter come such influences as the depression caused by long confinement, isolation, monotony of occupation, and the like. It is evident that the former causes of disease act upon all the prisoners, while the latter affect individuals with varying degrees of severity. In any large survey of prison mortality it is difficult to separate these two sets of causes, but in reason we must distinguish them as far as possible. In estimating the rates of prison mortality, we are glad to see that the author has not overlooked the essay by Dr. Baly, on the diseases and mortality of prisoners, in the twenty-eighth volume of the *Medico-Chirurgical Transactions*, and which was founded upon nearly twenty years' records of Millbank. After this discussion on prison mortality, which forms the first section of the book, follows a section of much practical value on the soil, building materials, windows, doors, &c., ventilation, warming, lighting, drainage, and the like. The third section deals more especially with the diet arrangements, clothing, exercise, discipline, education, and other details of internal management. The fourth section is devoted to the various modes of confinement in separation or in society, to a consideration of the Irish system, and of transportation. It will be seen at once that this useful little book should be in the hands of others besides medical readers. The author considers Captain Crofton's “*Irish System*” at some length, and expresses his belief that this system combines the advantages of several others without their drawbacks: he regrets that the system has not had that extension which it seems to deserve.

---

Mr. Poulett Scrope has published the remainder of the copies of

---

<sup>21</sup> “*Die Gefängnisse : ihre Einrichtung und Wirkung in hygienischer Beziehung.* Von Dr. Med. Baer. Berlin. 1871. Pp. 355.

the second edition of his great work on Volcanoes, accompanied only by some prefatory remarks, and a catalogue of recent earthquakes, &c.<sup>22</sup> The book can hardly be regarded as a third edition, seeing that the greater part of it consists really of the printed sheets of the second edition, but the remarks prefixed to the volume contain a valuable discussion of the theory of volcanic action, and the list of manifestations of volcanic energy from the year 1860 to the present date will be found exceedingly useful. Its value would, however, have been greatly increased had the author appended to each reference an indication of the best detailed description of the phenomena. With regard to modern theories of volcanic phenomena, Mr. Scrope expresses himself entirely opposed to the notion of the "igneous fluidity of the interior of the globe," which he thinks is very generally prevalent in the present day. He describes his own notions of the mode in which our earth has become solidified, and supports the opinion of the existence of "portions of liquid, or partially liquefied matter . . . in a thin belt, or more probably in pockets or vesicles here and there, at varying but still moderate distances from the outer surface." Volcanic eruptions and earthquakes he ascribes to changes in the amount of heat and pressure to which the materials contained in these hypothetical pockets are subjected. In the production of all these phenomena he attributes a powerful action to the water which always forms a constituent of molten lavas, but he does not believe that the access of water from the sea is at all an essential element in the business. With regard to the true character of ordinary crystalline lavas, the author maintains that the crystals exist in them at the moment of their issuing from the volcanic vent, an opinion which is shared by many geologists, and he ascribes an important part in producing their viscous fluidity to the presence throughout the mass of a certain amount of interstitial water, the rapid escape of which from the surface of the lava-stream would account for the almost instantaneous consolidation of the exposed portions. In these prefatory remarks Mr. Scrope further discusses the coincidence of volcanic disturbances with atmospheric disturbances and tidal action, the foliation of crystalline rocks, and the ratio of development of the subterranean forces.

Professor Zirkel has published as a supplementary volume<sup>23</sup> to the well-known text-book of chemical and physical geology of the late Gustav Bischof, those portions of materials which had been accumulated by that author for the continuation of his great work. Of the materials left by Bischof, his editor has suppressed only a few chapters which were too imperfect for publication—in other respects he has made no alterations. The contents of this supplementary volume are of a somewhat miscellaneous nature. The most important chapters

<sup>22</sup> "Volcanoes: the Character of their Phenomena, their Share in the Structure and Composition of the Surface of the Globe, and their Relation to its Internal Forces. With a Descriptive Catalogue of all known Volcanoes and Volcanic Formations. By G. Poulett Scrope. Second edition, with prefatory remarks, &c. 8vo. London: Longmans. 1872.

<sup>23</sup> "Lehrbuch der Chemischen und Physikalischen Geologie." Von Gustav Bischof. Supplement-Band. 8vo. Bonn: Adolph Marcus. 1871.

are the last seven, relating to volcanoes and volcanic phenomena and products, such as lavas, ashes, pumice, and basalts and melaphyres. Other sections of general interest relate to the sea and its currents, to the action of ice, and to the formation of sediments by particles floating in the water, these all forming one subject, illustrated in the last by some valuable experiments on the effects of slope upon the thickness of deposits.

The champions of Biblical orthodoxy are apparently becoming violently excited on scientific subjects, and several books bearing more or less upon the relations between the Bible and modern science have made their appearance. The great misfortune is that the authors of these works are, in general, as much opposed to each other in their scientific opinions, as the most atheistical of philosophers can be to the scientific statements of the Bible. Thus, to take two little books now before us, the anonymous author of one,<sup>24</sup> a reprint of a series of letters originally published in 1817 in opposition to Dr. Chalmers, declaims in general terms against the infidel tendency of science, and especially of astronomical science—all the teachings of which he seems to regard as utterly erroneous and atheistical in their tendency. This book is edited by one of the adherents of a gentleman styling himself "Parallax," who maintains that the earth is a plane, with the sun, moon, and stars at a comparatively small elevation above it. In the editorial portion of this work we are promised a chart of the earth upon this hypothesis, which, we think, will be a curiosity. Mr. James Elliot, on the contrary, the author of the second book,<sup>25</sup> accepts the facts taught by modern science, but endeavours to bring them into accordance with the statements regarding the creation of the world contained in the book of Genesis. In his view, the days of creation signify long periods of time, and in the geological department he follows the late Hugh Miller; but he goes a step beyond that distinguished writer, and endeavours to show how the formation of the world upon the nebular hypothesis is really described in the first chapter of Genesis. In the exegesis employed by the author the language of Scripture is often, as might be expected, so much strained that it cracks: and the curious nature of his scientific results may be understood, when we say that the formation of the sun on the fourth day is supposed by him to be subsequent to the carboniferous period! This little book, which appears to be honest in its design, is a proof (if one were wanting) of the utter impossibility of effecting a rational reconciliation between the facts of science and the statements of the so-called Mosaic cosmogony.

Two or three years ago we had to call attention to the publication of the second edition of Sir John Lubbock's "*Pre-historic Times*,"<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> "*Modern Science and the Bible: their Position and Direct Antagonism.*" Small 8vo. London: R. Banks. 1872.

<sup>25</sup> "*Moses and Modern Science.*" By James Elliot. Small 8vo. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1871.

<sup>26</sup> "*Pre-historic Times, as illustrated by Ancient Remains, and the Manners and Customs of Modern Savages.*" By Sir John Lubbock, Bart., M.P. Third edition. 8vo. London: Williams & Norgate. 1872.

and we have now the gratification of finding that the general appreciation of this admirable work is so great that already a new edition of it is called for. The view of the original state of man taken by Sir John Lubbock, as is probably pretty well known, is diametrically opposed to that entertained by the ultra-orthodox believers in a primitive state of perfection of the human race—in his opinion, our earliest ancestors lived not in a paradise, but rather in a purgatory of their own making. In this work he describes the remains left by those early European races which have passed away, without leaving behind them any written history—the weapons and implements of stone and bronze, the wonderful monuments raised over the bodies of the dead, the curious lake-dwellings which appear to have been so widely spread over Europe, the great shell-mounds of the Danish coast, and the objects of various kinds found associated with these—and indicates most clearly the inevitable deductions to be drawn from the consideration of all these things, with regard to the condition and mode of life of the pre-historic human beings who made and used them. From Europe Sir John passes to North America, the early archaeology of which possesses so much interest. He then describes the characteristic animal inhabitants of Europe during the Quaternary period, and the men who seem to have been associated with them, according to the information furnished by the explorations of caves in France and Belgium, and by the implements and other remains found in many places in river-gravels. The question of the antiquity of man follows naturally upon these matters, and the author gives the various calculations which have been made in order, if possible, to determine in years how long man has lived upon the earth. For his own part he seems to regard these estimates as not very satisfactory, but in *geological time* he carries back European man to the very confines of the tertiary period. Some writers, as is well known, have thought that they could find traces of human existence still earlier, in Pliocene and even in Miocene times, but at present the evidence upon this point is of a very doubtful character. Having thus shown what we can learn with regard to our remote ancestors, from the somewhat scanty remains of their structure and workmanship which have come down to us, but which nevertheless enable us to form in many cases a tolerably clear idea of some parts at least of their habits and modes of life, the author proceeds to describe, from the writings of trustworthy authorities, the peculiarities presented by modern savages, and to compare these with the indications furnished by the study of pre-historic archaeology. It is surprising to notice the light thrown upon the history of the earliest human inhabitants of the earth by the study of what is even at the present day going on among many savage races, and we may feel assured that, in spite of the opposition of primitive-perfectionists, the view adopted by our author of the primitive condition of man is the true one, and that it is only by the careful observation of the habits of living savages, that we shall be able to picture to ourselves what that primitive condition was, and what have been the steps by which civilized peoples have arrived at their present state of cultivation. Sir John Lubbock's book is most admirably put together, and in a fashion to carry the

reader forward with constant interest and without fatigue. The illustrations are numerous, well-executed, and most interesting.

Mr. Harting's beautifully printed volume on Shakespeare's ornithology<sup>7</sup> contains nine chapters on the eagle and larger birds of prey, hawks and hawking, the owl and its associations, the crows and their relations, the birds of song, the birds under domestication, the game birds and quarry flown at by falconers, wild fowl and sea fowl, with other miscellaneous birds. The allusions have been carefully collected out of the poet's works; so that numerous passages are adduced and illustrated where birds are spoken of. The volume is well written and enriched with a series of excellent illustrations. A table of ornithological allusions in the order in which they occur, the plays and poems being alphabetically arranged, with a good index, add to the usefulness of the volume, which we commend to the admirers of the poet as an interesting addition to Shakespearean literature by an intelligent naturalist.

## HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

**M**R. VAN LAUN has completed his translation of M. Taine's work,<sup>1</sup> and this second volume is as careful and painstaking as the first. It is, indeed, likely to be more interesting to general readers, for with most the interest increases as the historian approaches their own time. It includes three books of the original work: the third, the fourth, and the fifth. In the third, M. Taine deals with what he calls the classic age: the period of Dryden, Addison, and Swift; and such novelists as Defoe, Richardson, Fielding, Smollett, Sterne, and Goldsmith. Dryden's style M. Taine elaborately criticises, not, as it seems to us, happily. In this period he finds much that is piquant to speak about—with reprobation, of course. Indeed, he is so eager to justify his severity, that he inserts in his history those passages which he would expunge from the old English writers. With these specimens before us, we can pardon his indignation; but we cannot think with M. Taine that Dryden falls so far below the French dramatists as he occasionally rises above the taste of his own time. There is much more of excellence in Dryden than there is of impurity in Otway and Wycherley; yet we feel that M. Taine speaks with more power upon the latter subject than he does upon the former. Our English vice offends M. Taine by its grossness: "it is not delicate vice as in France" (p. 99). Yet he is willing to do justice to that

<sup>7</sup> "The Ornithology of Shakespeare critically examined, explained, and illustrated." By J. E. Harting, F.L.S., F.Z.S. London: Van Voorst.

<sup>1</sup> Taine's "History of English Literature." Translated by H. Van Laun. Edinburgh: Edmonston & Douglas.

national honesty of character which he attributes to writers with whom he has as little sympathy as he has with Tillotson. "He is not like the French preachers," says M. Taine, "who, by a courtly air, a well-delivered Advent-sermon, the refinements of a purified style, earn the first vacant bishopric and the favour of high society. But he writes like a perfectly honest man. We can see that he is not aiming in any way at the glory of an orator: he wishes to persuade soundly, nothing more." M. Taine has even a good word for Barrow; though he was, according to M. Taine, as agreeable as a dictionary, and would preach for an hour and a half before the Lord Mayor. "Were you not tired?" asked some one upon that occasion. "I did, in sooth, begin to be weary of standing so long," was Barrow's reply. M. Taine would, for critical purposes, have listened to him even longer, though his mind were, as he says, "doubled up as by the rolling weight of a flattening machine." For Addison, M. Taine has a sincere admiration. He furnished, he thinks, a model of the most solid English qualities perfected by Continental culture. He had lived in Paris and visited Boileau and Malebranche, and something of the French elegance was reflected in his style, though he could not help expressing his amusement at the fact that in France when a tailor accosted a shoemaker he congratulated himself on the honour of saluting him. But in morality "he crawls among commonplaces." His "Spectator" is only an honest man's manual, yet it is no small thing to make morality fashionable, and Addison did it. In the "Vision of Mirza" M. Taine finds an epitome of all Addison's characteristics. Swift, the next notable writer of this period, suffers in comparison with Voltaire, and the sad story of his life is retold, to explain his bitter and mocking gaiety, his great and unhappy genius. M. Taine's sketch is able and fairly just. The novelists, as they are more numerous, so are they more briefly dealt with. Our author deprecates the inexhaustible details of Richardson, the coarseness of Fielding, the rough, outspoken natures of other artists, as Samuel Johnson and Hogarth. With the later poets, as Pope, Gay, Akenside, and Young, come the change of taste and the modern era. "The human mind turned on its hinges, and so did civil society. When Roland, being made a minister, presented himself to Louis XVI. in a simple dress coat and shoes without buckles, the master of the ceremonies raised his hands to heaven, thinking all was lost. In fact all was changed." All indeed was changed at the beginning of the nineteenth century, nor are we surprised to find M. Taine ascribe so much to the influence of the French Revolution. Ideas as well as manners were transformed, and M. Taine is not unwilling to attribute something to German thought. "Those good folks who smoked and warmed themselves by the side of a stove found themselves suddenly the promoters and leaders of human thought. No race has such a comprehensive mind, none is so well endowed for lofty speculation. We see it in their language, so abstract that beyond the Rhine it seems an unintelligible jargon." And then there follows in M. Taine's book an analysis of the German character, which shows how high above national prejudice the true literary insight really is, for it does justice to the scepticism and mysticism of the German

mind—the mind of a people whose spirit can say, in Goethe's words:—

“In Lebensfluthen, im Thatensturm  
 Wall ich auf und ab,  
 Webe hin und her!  
 Geburt und Grab,  
 Ein ewiges Meer,  
 Ein wechselnd Weben  
 Ein glühend Leben,  
 So schaff ich am sausenden Webstuhl der Zeit  
 Und wirke der Gottheit lebendiges Kleid.”

Under these influences the nineteenth century was born. And now, if we English are likely to forget it, let a Frenchman repeat to us the following truth:—“The new spirit broke out first in a Scotch peasant—Robert Burns. Scarcely ever was seen together more of misery and talent.” The wretched story loses nothing in M. Taine's hands of dramatic effect. All men who are in advance of their age suffer. Such is not the case in England alone. Burns was forty years in advance of his, and he suffered in proportion. Through Burns we pass on to Byron and the more modern era. With the later part of this volume now translated into English, we feel less called upon to deal, because the last volumes of the original work were carefully criticised in this *Review* in 1865. The excellence of M. Taine's views of Dickens, Mill, and Macaulay was acknowledged—it was pointed out that his remarks upon Balzac were tinged with partiality—the admirable literary power of our author was freely admitted. All that he has written on these subjects is now open to the English reader in a translation so natural that we turn to the original to see that it is only a translation. And now comes the question, is M. Taine's a great book? Undoubtedly it is a noteworthy work; it throws cross-lights upon much that we might have missed or only half regarded. But he fails in his appreciation of Shakspeare (we had almost said because he is French); he is unfair to Dryden and to Pope, and he is only just to Burns because he thinks him a son of the French Revolution. His style is, however, the perfection of modern French. And what have we in that? It is a style that cannot fail to catch the eye and detain it, at least for a while. His book is made up of sparkling sentences—a page is like a handful of glittering sand. If you are in the mood and the sun shines upon it you may fancy yourself in possession of untold wealth; look at it and the glamour falls away. Yet after all you have something. For ourselves, we can agree with much that M. Taine says. We will quote his criticism of Wordsworth:—

“All the poets in the world would not reconcile us to so much tediousness. A cat playing with three dry leaves may furnish a philosophical reflection, and figure forth a wise man sporting with the fallen leaves of life; but eighty lines on such a subject make us yawn, much worse smile. At this rate you will find a lesson in an old tooth-brush. Doubtless also the ways of Providence are unfathomable, and a selfish and brutal workman like Peter Bell may be converted by the beautiful conduct of an ass full of virtue and unselfishness, but this sentimental prettiness quickly grows insipid. We are not overpleased

to see a grave man seriously imitate the language of nurses, and we murmur to ourselves that with so many emotions he must wet many handkerchiefs."

Herr Hettner's History<sup>2</sup> corresponds to a portion of M. Taine's. It is the "History of English Literature during the Eighteenth Century," and his present volume forms only one part of a larger work which has already met with such acceptance in Germany that most of it is in a third edition. The design of the work may be thus stated: It is a history of the progress of enlightenment (*Aufklärung*) in the three great European countries, for, as this enlightenment is mirrored in science, art, and poetry, so the history of literature becomes the history of a people's advance in culture and general civilization. Herr Hettner seeks to trace this progress in literature. He compares it as Goethe compared the history of knowledge to a great fugue in which the English, French, and German bear a part. One nation resumes the theme where the other has broken it off, whilst the grand prevailing dominant so unites them that nowhere is a true note struck or a real thought aroused that does not become the property of the whole. Herr Hettner thus explains his design (p. 9):—

"My history follows the course of events. The starting point is English literature, for there, in the growth of the sciences, in the philosophy of experience, and in the design are to be found the first articulate utterances of the modern spirit. The first part of my work, therefore, contains the history of English literature from the Restoration to the time when the English ideas of enlightenment passed over to France, and Voltaire, Montesquieu, Rousseau, and the encyclopædists began to distance the English writers. The second part represents the development of the modern French literature and its modifying influence upon the life and culture of other peoples. The third part represents German literature in connexion with French and English."

It is only the first part with which we are now concerned. The earliest writer with whom Herr Hettner deals is Newton. He places him at the head of the army which was to liberate mankind from superstition. He sees no drawback to his great services in the deep religious feeling which he admits Newton cherished. "His theology," he says, "is forgotten; his profound science remains, and will remain for ever." He acknowledges, as Buckle has done, the aid which Hooker gave to toleration, and in Milton he recognises the foremost poet of freedom, though Milton did not live to see the full day of English liberty. Butler, the author of "Hudibras" and the favourite of the Revolution, sang the death-song of Puritanism as Cervantes proclaimed the death of Chivalry. Of Dryden, Herr Hettner speaks in a more favourable, and, to our mind, a more instructive tone than M. Taine. Without over-rating his poetical significance, he regards him as one of those at the head of the modern epoch. His influence upon his contemporaries was, he thinks, immense: "From his first appearance as author until his death, Dryden seemed to all his rivals, in spite of the unpopularity which his dissolute character justly

---

<sup>2</sup> "Geschichte der Englischen Literatur, von der Wiederherstellung des Königthums bis in die Zweite Hälfte des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts," von Herrmann Hettner. Braunschweig.



awakened, as the highest and almost unattainable ideal of a poet. He was indisputably the head and leader of the entire order." What Newton was in science Locke was in philosophy. The keynote of Newton's science, "Beware of metaphysics," was adopted by Locke in philosophy. The chapter on Locke, Toland, and Shaftesbury is very just, and leads to a consideration of the position of the Freemasons in the eighteenth century. Perhaps Herr Hettner is inclined to attach too much importance to this portion of his subject. Lessing, it is well known, was a Freemason, and had no very high opinion of the institution to which he belonged. Indeed, whatever good characteristics it possesses are the common property of every free and generous mind. Pope is the heir of Dryden, whom he surpassed in skill of artistic expression, not in the power of poetic feeling. Byron said of him, "He is a Greek temple with a Gothic cathedral on one side and a Turkish mosque and all kinds of pagodas and chapels around him." Byron's admiration fills our author with astonishment, who sees in Pope the poet of the dilettanti alone. The lives of Defoe and Swift bring the book to the Georgian era. Bolingbroke, who is depicted as a brilliant many-sided but unscrupulous man, naturally occupies a prominent position in an estimate of the period. The letters of Junius are described as having exercised an immense influence upon the time. Herr Hettner accepts the theory that Sir Philip Francis was the author of the renowned papers, the difficulties which are in the way of this belief notwithstanding. Their popularity in this country he accounts for, not by their trenchant and polished style, but by the fact that they are grounded upon principles which are of the essence of the English character—a free press and liberty of the subject. From Adam Smith, Hume, and Gibbon we pass on to Johnson. "He stood," says Herr Hettner, "upon the boundary of two epochs. Soon came new men and new ideas; his star waned. He deserved as little the exaggerated abuse of Tieck and Schlegel as he deserved the extravagant admiration of his contemporaries." A review of the novelists follows, of Goldsmith, Smollett, and Sterne, who have always been favourites in Germany; and the poets close the century and the book. Thomson and Young occupy a short chapter. The poems of Ossian, the forgeries of Ireland and Chatterton, those remarkable phenomena of the last century, follow in order. Nothing is more curious in literary history than the success which the Celtic forgeries met with in Germany; even our author does not seem free from their fascination. It is almost with regret that he says: "They are now as little esteemed as they were formerly overvalued." Of Burns he speaks with no less enthusiasm than does M. Taine. His chapter on the poet is pleasanter reading than the corresponding chapter in the French work. He says:—

"The circle in which Burns moves is not a large one. It includes love, Highland scenery, and liberty, which takes the form of a longing for the restoration of the true Stuarts. But everywhere we meet the bright and thoughtful eye of the healthy son of the village, and yet the eye of a poet who has seen into the heart of things, and who can paint and form

them with striking distinctness, nay, with almost Homeric touch. Burns adds, too, a rhyme and a rhythm which, to use Carlyle's expression, need no music; for they are music. Sprung from the poetry of the people, Burns' songs have again become the poetry of the people."

The admirers of M. Taine will miss here the glittering epigrammatic style to which they are accustomed, but possibly the fulness of the ideas and the kindly genial spirit in which they are presented will go far to compensate for the loss.

Another history of English Literature has appeared.<sup>3</sup> It is unlike the two preceding works. Its design is, it is true, different from that of the others; so too is the amount of knowledge and judgment which its author brings to his subject. Professor Yonge is, if we remember rightly, the author of an English-Greek Lexicon which strikes even schoolboys as bad. A professor of modern history may not perhaps be expected to excel in Greek, but it is with some sense of incongruity that we see a Professor of English literature writing in a style which is not grammatical. We are willing to attribute the curious English of the dedication to Professor Yonge's printer, but the faults do not end there. The Professor has intended to produce a class-book of the history of our literature from the birth of Shakespeare to the death of Dickens, and to illustrate each author by selections from his works. As a history it is incomplete and incorrect, as a selection it is ill-chosen. It is incomplete, for it leaves Spenser to be dealt with in two pages of an appendix, and it omits most of the Elizabethan dramatists and some of the best lyrists, while for its general want of correctness we shall refer only to the passage on the Massacre of Glencoe. The author's view of Milton is curious and we think unique. We said the selection was ill-chosen. There are nine pages of extracts from Southey, while Coleridge, "who certainly did nothing worthy of his talents, is represented by 'Geneviève' and a few lines from 'Christabel,' a poem which is interesting *from having suggested to Scott the metre of the 'Lay of the Last Minstrel.'*" It is possible Professor Yonge may find readers: he says himself in his introduction, "Of historians the student must be contented with what is only comparatively good," but we do not like his English and we do not recommend his book.

No Englishman can complain of the reception which our authors meet with in Germany. It is little to say that the knowledge which an ordinarily educated German has of English literature will far surpass the acquaintance which an Englishman has with the great names of German literature. And this is not owing to the superior excellence of our English names. The welcome which the works of Scott and Byron<sup>4</sup> found in Germany was owing to the receptive nature of the German mind for any excellence with which it came in contact. Cosmopolitan enthusiasm is a German characteristic, and there is no

<sup>3</sup> "Three Centuries of English Literature." By C. D. Yonge, Regius Professor of Modern History and English Literature in Queen's College, Belfast.

<sup>4</sup> "Lord Byron: a Biography With a critical Essay on his place in Literature." By Karl Elze. Translated with the author's sanction. London: John Murray. 1872.

lack of enthusiasm in Dr. Elze's "Life of Lord Byron." Byron's case is perhaps exceptional, he dazzled all continental nations almost as much as he dazzled our own. All speak of him with admiration. If there is to be a reaction against this, as we think there will be, it is his own country that will initiate it. Goethe's admiration for the poet is well known. Villemain says of him "Ce qui survit de Byron, ce qui le représente aujourd'hui, c'est son génie de poëte si hautement reconnu chez les deux grandes nations qui parlent la langue Anglaise, et si admiré chez presque toutes autres." Dr. Elze comes behind no admirer of Lord Byron. The French have considered him our greatest poet since Milton. Dr. Elze places him with Shakespeare. In spite of this we much recommend his chapter on Byron's place in literature. He there quotes the praise of Goethe to which we have referred. "All the husks and dross of the individual and his time, through which and out of which the best has to work his way, were only momentary, fleeting, and perishable, whereas the astonishing fame to which he has now and for ever raised his country remains boundless in its glory and incalculable in its effects." We do not agree with Dr. Elze, and certainly not with the extravagant language of Goethe, nor do we think that Dr. Elze's book can, in this country at least, raise the popular estimate of the poet. Excessive partiality defeats its own ends. Our present biographer admits errors as well as injudicious praise into his history. The story of the destruction of the memoirs is one that can be brought to the proof, and in this particular Dr. Elze is incorrect. We have already said sufficient to indicate that the German biographer discredits the assertions of Mrs. Stowe; we may add, without expressing an opinion on either side, that to this portion of his subject he brings no new light. Dr. Elze is very severe upon the enemies of Lord Byron. Personal enemies he can have none: he has now passed so far from us that reprobation means much more than it did thirty years ago. That there are those who cannot like him is not simply owing to his magnificent genius. If his genius was great, his sins against art and taste were great too. Walter Scott has not yet lost his hold of the fancy of the young: Byron is rapidly losing his. It is not that our youth are wiser, perhaps; it is that Byron belonged to the early part of the century, and to it alone. A poet who rebels against the faults of an age or an epoch will be great so long as the age lasts; but, when the period has passed, posterity will wonder at the enthusiasm which he awakened. The place of Byron in literature has yet to be determined. We may be sure that his significance has not been underrated; and most certainly it has not been underrated by Dr. Elze.

Dr. Ebert's "Life of Sir Walter Scott"<sup>5</sup> has, we are glad to see, reached a second edition. The book has been now for ten years before the world, and it could scarcely fail to please its readers. It is written in a simple and charming style, and with an enthusiastic admiration for the great novelist which would not misbecome a Scotchman born.

---

<sup>5</sup> "Walter Scott, ein Lebensbild," von Dr. Felix Ebert. Zweite verbesserte Auflage. Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel.

Sir Walter Scott has always been popular on the Continent, where his works are well known through the medium of translations. Heine said of him: "Scott has rejoiced and pacified my heart—even the very imitations of him rejoice me" (vol. i. p. 172). Goethe called him in 1827, "the richest, most talented, and renowned narrator of his century" (vol. xxxiii. p. 166). And he is as familiar a subject for German essayists as for English writers. It is no wonder, then, that the gracefully written work of Dr. Eberty should be popular in Germany. Yet it is unlike most German biographies. There is no attempt to estimate the works of Sir Walter. The book is written by an admirer who takes the worth of his subject for granted. In England Sir Walter Scott's life is one of those which are best known to general readers. The glamour which so long hung about the Great Unknown has lost none of its power for English eyes now that the prophet has unveiled himself. The kindly Celtic face is as well known to this generation as it was to the last. We know Sir Walter's dog better than we do many poets of our own generation, and the hospitable roof of Abbotsford still entertains innumerable guests who have never seen it with corporal vision. Dr. Eberty throws this fairy-land open to German readers. He styles his book a "life-portrait," and there could be no more flattering testimony to the power of the Scotch writer than the sincere love with which Dr. Eberty speaks of him. This is scarcely the place to estimate the real position of the novelist in the history of literature, and whether we agree or not with Dr. Eberty in his admiration of Sir Walter, we must look kindly upon the words with which he closes his biography, and which will illustrate his enthusiasm: "We may say with the old Hellenic hero, that many immortal children survive to preserve his renown, for so long as poetry delights the world, so long will his songs and stories keep alive in the hearts of all peoples the name of Walter Scott."

A great war is as inevitably followed by a train of books as a camp by sutlers. We propose to say but little of the books before us. Their names will sufficiently show their design. The "Illustrated Chronicle" is the handsomest, and for general purposes the best. With a clear and fair story of the war from a German point of view, it combines a series of portraits and pictures which are interesting and are fully explained in foot-notes. The portraits seem to us good, and the plans, of which there are many, intelligible. Some of the engravings, however, strike us as familiar. Did not the picture on page 177 once appear in the *Illustrated London News*?

"Cassell's History of the War" is inferior. The engravings are coarse and indistinct, and the history is a *rechauffé* from the newspapers. The portraits are fallacious and abominable, and the plans small and badly-printed.

"Thaten und Phrasen" is a useful work for any student of the late

<sup>6</sup> "Illustrirte Kriegeschronik." Leipzig.

<sup>7</sup> "Cassell's History of the War between France and Germany." London: Cassell, Petter, and Galpin.

<sup>8</sup> "Thaten und Phrasen im deutsch-französischen Kriege." Leipzig.

war. It contains all the despatches and news chronologically arranged from the 3rd of July, 1870 to the 6th of March, 1871, thus forming a compendious history of events. The very sensible and intelligent plan is adopted of arranging the German documents upon one side and the foreign documents upon the opposite page. The book has also a map of the theatre of war, showing the portions of France occupied by the invading troops.

Herr Lotheissen's contribution<sup>9</sup> to the history of the eighteenth century is by no means one of the numerous books which owe their existence to the late conflict between the two great Continental nations. It was already prepared for publication when the storm burst forth and delayed for a late summer all literary blossom and flower. And very wisely Herr Lotheissen determined to preserve his work free from undue reference to contemporary events. It is seldom that he alludes to them, and when he does so, it is in a kindly and philosophic spirit, which admirably becomes a historian. Thus, when he speaks of Mercier's prophecy in the years of the revolution that Paris must perish, he says:—"We do not believe even now that the prophecy is near its accomplishment. Paris will survive, as will France, her present misfortunes, and tread the path, though it may be after fierce internal pangs, of serene self-development, and will gain once more her right position. It would be a misfortune even for Germany if it fell out otherwise, for in spite of fire and sword the two peoples are inseparately bound together (p. 99)." When a German author can write in this style, it is evident that he has reached the impartial elevation which is proper to a historian. And the present book is really marked by a clear insight into the troublous but great times of the French Revolution. In an introduction of considerable power the author depicts the state of society during the rococo period which preceded the Revolution, the licentious and heartless reign of false taste and false sentiment under a Pompadour and Dubarry, and the slight veneer which covered a society the most corrupt of modern times, and a misery more widespread than had ever existed before. Even the advocates of royal license were reduced to strange shifts. "It is rather hard," said Barbier, "that the king's relation to the Pompadour should attract so much attention, when the lives of his subjects, as of the Prince of Rohan, and the Duke of Lauzun, attract so little." The Church was in no better condition than the State. Parasites of the nobles, the clergy found their way to preferment, not by learning or ability, but by their capacity for social pleasantry and their readiness in jest and repartee. Art was degenerate too. Watteau and his pupils Paterre and Lancret were widely popular, Greuze had to fight his way to a just renown. In architecture a maze of mean and restless lines, and a profusion of distracting decoration had usurped the honours due to a severer style. Nothing was real or natural, everything was superficial and insincere. The apostle of the new era was Jean Jacques Rousseau. "His 'contrat social,' " says Herr

<sup>9</sup> "Literatur und Gesellschaft in Frankreich, zur Zeit der Revolution, 1789-1794." Von Ferdinand Lotheissen. Wien. 1872. London: D. Nutt.

Lotheissen, "was the introductory manifesto of the Revolution." And yet, curiously enough, for a long while Rousseau was the favourite writer of the aristocracy. In fact, they did not realize their position and the danger that stood so near. But in 1789, in one month alone, six thousand passports were issued to rich families. So soon were the dams broken down when once the waters began to trickle through. Ludicrous incidents, such as the banishment of court cards on account of their titles, were plentiful it is true; but the main events of the Revolution were pure tragedy. Manners were changed; the traditions of gallantry and politeness could hold their ground no longer; and those 'appalling phenomena which visit a city during a pestilence or supreme distress made their appearance. Reckless gambling, open prostitution, and utter lawlessness held high revel; inspiration and devotion, lust and hate, were mingled together in these terrible times. Amid the confusion there arose one or two gigantic figures above the others—Mirabeau and Chamfort, Volney, Fauchet, and Condorcet. Herr Lotheissen gives admirable sketches of these characters. In the very throes of the revolution, literature of course there was none. Men do not sing during a deadly struggle, nor speak much; at most their utterances are fierce cries and ejaculations, a "*Marseillaise*," or "*Où ira*," but before and after the poets and orators have much to say. About this time the Press rose into importance. Our author traces its history from the commencement, in the days of Richelieu. It is a curious story. Renaudot, a hundred years before the Revolution, was, they say, an unsuccessful surgeon in Paris, probably he was a quack pure and simple. Medicine failing him, he became a commission agent and the head of a bureau which had many branches, and a wide correspondence in all parts of the world. With mere business matters his correspondents often mingled political news of importance, and so it came about that he was better informed in European affairs than his neighbours, and drew to his bureau an inquisitive and gossiping crowd of newsmongers, who spread through Paris the information which they acquired in his office. For their convenience Renaudot at last had a single sheet printed, which contained all the noteworthy events with which his correspondents acquainted him, and which, perhaps somewhat magniloquently, he entitled *Gazette de France*. This paper soon grew from one into eight sheets, became both troublesome and dangerous to its enterprising proprietor, and was read far and wide. The first number brought news from Rome, Constantinople, Mayence, Venice, and Frankfort. On internal affairs it was discreetly silent. But Renaudot had important assistants. Richelieu quickly saw to what purpose he might turn the timorous sheet, and employed it for those declarations which he did not care to insert in his despatches. And there were other stories whispered. It is well known that Louis XIII. and his royal spouse were by no means upon the best of terms. They were both subject to the cardinal, and neither of them could admit a second superior. In this family warfare the king was generally defeated. To avenge his defeat, he had, it is said, recourse to secret weapons. Disguised and unknown, he was wont to present himself in Renaudot's office with

manuscripts which he entrusted to none but the editor, and which appeared in the next issue of the *Gazette*. These papers always hinted at an approaching separation between the royal pair, or at some similar extreme measure, which we may be sure the king would have at once taken if he dared. Some gratification, however, he seems to have derived from the queen's discomfiture when she perused the anonymous reports. From this commencement the press rapidly grew; and in the short interval between May 1789 and May 1795 no less than a thousand journals of varying ability were started, for after the taking of the Bastille the liberty of the press was established. Amidst these voices there was naturally little harmony, but even in the confusion some journalists exercised considerable influence, and made themselves heard, though these were not always the great men of the period. Mirabeau failed as a journalist; Loustalot, a young man who died at the age of twenty-eight, was eminently successful; Herr Lotheissen thinks that the characteristics of the Revolution were mirrored in the writings of four journalists; its unbridled and frivolous licentiousness was represented by Camille Desmoulins; its passionate fury by Marat; its reaction by Sureau; and its impotent moderation by Mallet du Pan. Of these men our author gives a vivid picture. Marat he describes as a small man, with a sallow pock-pitted countenance, black flat hair, blood-shot blinking eyes, a spasmodically-twitching mouth, and his whole appearance set off by plain ill-fitting dirty clothing. But one of the most interesting literary figures of the Revolution was the poet André Chenier. His mother was a Greek lady, and for him the relics and fancies of classical antiquity had a deep and abiding fascination. Lycoris and Glycere are the themes of his early songs; he had soon to sing a deeper and sadder strain. In 1787 he came as an attaché to London, where he remained for four years. His warm eastern nature pined in our foggy climate. "To me, without friends," he wrote, "or acquaintances, forgotten on earth, far from my own country, and smitten by the waves that beat upon this unkindly isle, the sweet memory of France is ever present." In 1790 he was back in Paris, speaking in fiery poems to his countrymen. There was no compromise. The enemies of freedom were of his own land. "If they triumph," he says, "it is better to be slain by them than to be regarded as their friends." They did triumph, and he was slain by them. We cannot go through the events which led to his fate. It was not long before the terrorists imprisoned him in St. Lazare. In the prison with him were many of his old friends—Noailles, Rohan, Montmorency, and others, and a fair young girl, Aimée de Coigny. She is the heroine of his poem, 'The Young Prisoner,' and she was the poet's last love. Alfred de Vigny has told the story of these gloomy days; we have no space to re-tell it here. Chenier was condemned and executed on the same day, July 25th, 1794. He went to the scaffold with his friend and fellow-poet Boucher. As they were drawn to the fatal spot, André placed his hand to his brow, and uttered the well-known words—"Pourtant j'avais quelque chose là!" Two days later Robespierre himself perished. If it had only been earlier!

For the literary aspect of the subject no book is better adapted to

interest the reader than Herr Lotheissen's. We have given but an imperfect sketch of the matter, we trust that an English translation will bring it within the range of many more readers.

Mr. Zincke has written a very pleasant book about Egypt,<sup>10</sup> a very pleasant and interesting book, even though some of his opinions may be speculative and inconclusive. Mr. Zincke is, for instance, of opinion that the Egyptians were an Aryan race, and he argues the point (chap. iii.) with considerable ingenuity, from the testimony of their language, their religion, and their art. Their system of caste bears him out, he thinks, in this supposition. Perhaps he scarcely attaches sufficient importance to the philological argument. Nothing decisive, he says, can be concluded from the language, and dismisses it in a paragraph. But his own studies of the people are valuable, and his opinions unprejudiced. Mr. Zincke is an intelligent traveller, who tells his readers exactly such facts about the country as they would wish to know, and in so pleasant a manner that they may become fellow-travellers with him if they will. As an instance of his power in this direction, we would mention the chapters entitled "Going to the Top of the Great Pyramid," and "Luncheon at the Pyramids;" while, as an instance of his ability to write in a higher vein, we would cite his chapter headed 'Why the Hebrew Scriptures ignore Future Life,' which is thoughtful and suggestive. So, too, is the essay upon the Comparative Happiness of an English and Egyptian Labourer. The style of the book is captivating, and its appearance attractive.

Our next work<sup>11</sup> is of a different character. Mr. White tells us that, "having by the Divine blessing arrived at a period of existence when in a great measure he had overcome the toil and trouble of active life," he has, in short, turned his attention to the early history of Scotland; and after no inconsiderable amount of research, presents us with the present volume as the result of his investigations. His chief authority is "John Barbour, Archdeacon of Aberdeen;" but a list of authorities, three pages long, including Grote's "History of Greece," "Translations of Herodotus and Thucydides," and the "Poetical Works of Sir Walter Scott," testify to his more extensive reading. The point, however, upon which Mr. White mostly insists is the fact that he has personally examined the scene of the battle. Of the battle itself and its results he speaks with an enthusiasm which makes us almost forget that it was fought five centuries and a half ago, and he thinks it worth while to mention the story that on the same day the battle was fought a knight, in bright shining armour, intimated to the inhabitants of Aberdeen how the Scottish army had gained a glorious victory over their enemies of England. "Soon afterwards," he adds, "this warrior, mounted on horseback, was seen to pass over Pentland Firth." A map, and the armorial bearings of some of the Scottish warriors, illustrate the book.

---

<sup>10</sup> "Egypt of the Pharaohs and the Khedive." By F. Barham Zincke, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. Smith, Elder, and Co.

<sup>11</sup> "History of the Battle of Bannockburn." By R. White. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas.



A new work<sup>12</sup> from the Record Office calendars an interesting series of papers. It registers the documents relating to the murders of Rizzio and Darnley, the marriage of Mary and Bothwell, the Queen's imprisonment in Lochleven and her subsequent escape to England. Besides the Scotch papers, which are more briefly dismissed as being better known, there are papers referring to events in France and Flanders. The French papers consist of the despatches of Sir Thomas Hoby and Sir Henry Norris, who describes at length the military manoeuvres then taking place. Throughout his correspondence we see that he is conscious of the danger to the English queen, which arose from the residence of the Queen of Scots in her country. Indeed, these letters are some of the most important documents calendared. The Flemish letters give an account of those troubles in the Low Countries, which led to the freedom of the people, and belong to the period into which Goethe gives such a remarkable insight in his "Egmont." The majority of the letters, it is true, describe only the diplomatic arrangements of the commissioners; some, however, have reference to the proceedings of the Iconoclasts, the march of Alva, and the treacherous arrest of the heroic Egmont and Horn. In this portion mention is made of a MS. history of the Netherlands, which seems of some importance. The Italian, Swedish, and Spanish letters are fewer and of less interest. Mr. Crosby supplies a clear preface and a full and excellent index.

The name of the book which Sir Travers Twiss has edited<sup>13</sup> will not suggest to the general reader its nature. Briefly stated, its history is as follows:—About two centuries ago there was in the Registry of the Admiralty a MS. collection of the customs and usages of the sea, known probably from the colour of its cover, as the "Blacke Booke of the Admiralty." Dr. Exton, judge of the High Court of Admiralty, describes it as written in an ancient hand, in the ancient French language. In the Registry it remained during the 18th century, as we know from the writings of Sir E. Simpson and Sir C. Robinson, but in 1809 it was missing; for in that year Professor A. Luders, who had occasion to consult it, was informed by the proper officer that he had never seen such a book, and knew nothing of it. Nor has it since been found. An English copy of much more modern date did duty for it, and this, too, has nearly been lost to the public. Certain MSS., however, in the British Museum, some of them containing only portions of the text, have enabled Dr. Twiss, after an evidently painful collation, to restore the text with reasonable accuracy. The introduction contains an account of the MSS. and their dates. The result of these labours is now before us. Even to a lay reader the book contains much that is interesting. The earliest ordinances date from the reign of Henry I. They were considerably augmented in the reigns of Richard I. and John. One of the most important portions

<sup>12</sup> "Calendar of State Papers, (Foreign Series) of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1566-1568." Edited by Allan James Crosby, B.A. Oxon., under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. London: Longmans and Co.

<sup>13</sup> "The Black Book of the Admiralty." Edited by Sir Travers Twiss, Q.C., D.C.L. London: Longmans and Co.

of the book is that relating to the "Laws of Oleron." These laws, we are informed by an old memorandum, were laws and statutes of the sea, which were published in the Island of Oleron by the Lord Richard, formerly King of England. They were named "*La Ley Oleroun*." Dr. Twiss, however, argues that they were not so much made as approved and republished by Richard, and that they were in reality "the result of certain legal privileges granted by the Dukes of Guienne to the Commune of Oleron prior to the island passing into the possession of the British Crown." With these laws in the original French, Dr. Twiss prints an English rendering from a rare book of the 16th century, known as "*The Rutter of the Sea*." Some of these laws are curious. Thus we read: "It is established for a custom of the sea, that yf a ship is lost by defaulte of the lodeman, the maryners may, if they please, bring the lodeman to the windlass or any other place, and cut off his head, without the maryners being bounde to answer before any judge, because the lodeman has committed high treasone against his undertakyn of the pilotage." It is almost unnecessary to add that Dr. Twiss has accomplished his task with consummate ability and with unwearied diligence and research.

Mr. Long's volume<sup>14</sup> takes us over ground which we have trodden with Mr. Long before. It is that portion of Roman history which refers to Cæsar's Gallic Campaigns, and the contemporaneous events at Rome. But Mr. Long is not a pleasant companion as a historian. He has a dictatorial and querulous undertone which greatly detracts from the value of his books. It would be easy to exemplify this. We open the present volume at random. "Some persons read the text of Cicero" thus and thus, "but I do not" (p. 99). "The oration of Cicero is very difficult, but a man who knows no more of elections than Wunder is not well qualified to explain it" (p. 275). The same tone pervades his Cæsar. His historical researches are, however, untouched by our criticism. Mr. Long gives great praise to Napoleon's "*Histoire de César*," which he commends for having what his own book lacks—an atlas of good maps. Our author discusses exhaustively the history of the British invasions, and the various theories as to the times and places of landing. The present volume brings the history down to the period of Cicero's administration in Cilicia.

The fourth volume<sup>15</sup> of the new series of the Duke of Wellington's Despatches extends over the period of a year, from May, 1827, to August, 1828. It is impossible in our brief space to give even a synopsis of the contents; perhaps the correspondence relating to the formation of the Ministry, in the beginning of the year 1828, will be read with most interest. The changes which took place in the Ministry in the May of that year involved a vast amount of letter-writing which is here preserved, as is also the correspondence between the Duke of Clarence and his Royal brother in reference to the difference about

<sup>14</sup> "The Decline of the Roman Republic." By George Long. Vol. iv. London: Bell and Daldy.

<sup>15</sup> "Despatches, Correspondence, and Memoranda of Field-Marshal Arthur Duke of Wellington, K.G." Edited by his son, the Duke of Wellington, in continuation of the former series. Vol. iv. London: John Murray.

Sir George Cockburn. There is also a long memoir of the Eastern question.

We pass into the region of political biography. Lord George Bentinck has found a biographer in his friend Mr. Disraeli.<sup>16</sup> The book is now in its eighth edition, and may therefore be considered a literary success. It is curious and interesting in many respects. The twenty-fourth chapter is especially so, for it contains Mr. Disraeli's opinions upon the Jewish race. The question of Jewish disability was the question which detached Lord George Bentinck from the head of his party, and Mr. Disraeli's utterances upon the subject are still interesting and impressive. He points out the likeness and unlikeness between the peoples of the Greeks and the Hebrews, and dwells with justifiable pride upon the fact that while the former nation appears exhausted, "the genius of Israel never shone so bright. And when the Russian, the Frenchman, and the Anglo-Saxon, amid applauding theatres or the choral voices of solemn temples, yield themselves to the full spell of a Mozart, a Meyerbeer, or a Mendelssohn, it seems difficult to comprehend how these races can reconcile it to their hearts to persecute a Jew." Mr. Disraeli, in reperusing this work for a new edition, after twenty years, finds that the statements of facts are rigidly accurate, and is gratified at the impartial spirit which his book displays.

Mr. Adams does not aim at much in his little book,<sup>17</sup> but he is successful in accomplishing his design. This volume gives a very fair account of the most distinguished English statesmen, in language suited to youthful students. The list includes the lives of the two Pitts, Lord Castlereagh, Mr. Canning, and Sir Robert Peel, and concludes with a resumé of the career of Lord Aberdeen. As becomes such a work, it is free from political prejudice or party feeling, and will well supplement the more meagre details of school histories.

Mr. Rankine's little memoir is upon the whole well-written.<sup>18</sup> We wish that he had dispensed with the tributary letters of his appendix. These testimonials to Mr. Elder's religion are as unnecessary as they are offensive, and such as we are sure their subject would have disliked. "I should conclude," says the Rev. W. Fraser, "that generally he was reserved on these matters. Never were they obtruded on the general company." So the Rev. W. Fraser obtrudes them. But we can scarcely understand the book's *raison d'être*. John Elder was, we should say, judging from the portrait and memoir before us, as manly and modest as he was successful. His life has the general moral that virtue is likely to win affection and sometimes success. Such biographies may perhaps be useful if they can find readers.

Our next book<sup>19</sup> is a history of the Reformation, written from a

<sup>16</sup> "Lord George Bentinck : a Political Biography." By the Right Honourable B. Disraeli. Eighth edition. London : Longman, Green, and Co.

<sup>17</sup> "The Men at the Helm : Biographical Sketches of great English Statesmen." By W. H. D. Adams. Edinburgh : Gall and Inglis

<sup>18</sup> "Memoir of John Elder, Engineer." By W. J. H. Rankine. Edinburgh : W. Blackwood and Sons.

<sup>19</sup> "The Men and Women of the English Reformation." By S. H. Burke. London : R. Washbourne.

Roman Catholic point of view, and so far valuable as it is the expression of opinions at variance with the received beliefs. In this work, of course, Henry VIII. receives but little quarter: He is represented as a licentious, unscrupulous, irreligious monster, which indeed may be the true account; but the arguments here will convince no one. As a matter of fact, the letters to Anna Boleyn adduced will win over most people to the king's side, as far as the divorce question is concerned. The article upon John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, is more effective. The fall of Anna Boleyn is described with an unkindly exultation. There is a good chapter upon "Clerical Reformers," directed in some degree against Mr. Froude, which will repay perusal.

Our next work is the *Life of Helen Duchess of Orleans*, by Herr Brunier.<sup>20</sup> Twice before this biography has been written; Herr Brunier thinks there is place for a third book. He is an Orleanist, and sees in the Orleans dynasty France's sole hope of salvation. He expresses the wish "that France, which of all nations is least suited for a republic, may find in the Count of Paris, who has inherited many of his mother's good qualities, a blessing and a king, and that they may feel towards him the same emotions of love and honour which they exhibited towards his mother;" and our author adds the prayer, that as the Duchess belonged to both nations by her goodness and gracious understanding, both French and Germans may, before her shadow, reach to each other the hands of reconciliation and friendship. We doubt if his prayer will reach the ears of the gods.

The "Book of Parliamentary Anecdote"<sup>21</sup> is as dull as its title would suggest it to be. The stories have the familiarity, though not the excellence of a jest-book. As a record of the origin of parliamentary cant phrases it may sometimes be useful; it will never be an entertaining companion.

## BELLES LETTRES.

**M**R. MAIN<sup>1</sup> has, we think, done George Eliot a great wrong. He is one of those officious friends, who are always bringing you into trouble. He is what has been well called "your worst enemy, — your worshipper." But as he does not know exactly what to worship, he worships anything, good, bad, or indifferent. Platitudes, Tupperisms, commonplaces, all excite his admiration. Now a really judicious book of extracts from George Eliot's writings

<sup>20</sup> "Eine Mecklenburg Fürstentochter" (Helene Herzogin von Orleans). Von Ludwig Brunier. Bremen. 1872.

<sup>21</sup> "A Book of Parliamentary Anecdote." By G. Jennings and W. S. Johnstone. London: Cassell, Petter, and Galpin.

<sup>1</sup> "Wise, Witty, and Tender Sayings in Prose and Verse, selected from the Works of George Eliot." By Alexander Main. London and Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons. 1872.

would be a very valuable addition to our literature. But then it should be edited, as Herr Merz has edited his delightful little work "*Goethe als Erzieher*." The subjects should be arranged under different heads. It would be most interesting to get at a glance George Eliot's views on progress, religion, philosophy, art, and other kindred subjects. But Mr. Main has adopted the worst possible plan. He has simply gone through George Eliot's published works, and pitched every aphorism, or what appeared to him an aphorism, at the reader's head. It has been justly brought as a charge against English literature, that we are particularly weak in aphoristic writing. We have no writer of apothegms to set against Pascal or Vauvenargues. We are altogether wanting in that delicate psychological analysis, and in that high idealistic feeling, which distinguishes Joubert or Novalis, and which lifts them into the highest worlds of feeling and thought. Now we are bold enough to think that this reproach might be considerably lessened by a judicious selection of aphorisms from George Eliot's writings. But then Mr. Main does not know where to look for them. He apparently only knows George Eliot by her published works. For anything which we can tell to the contrary, he is absolutely ignorant of all her essays, papers, and criticisms, which are buried in the pages of reviews and periodicals, and which, in our opinion, form some of the most valuable portions of her writings, and in which she has, at all events, spoken out her real thoughts more plainly and boldly than anywhere else. But instead of taking the pains to examine these less known writings, Mr. Main has been content to give us such stuff as—"There may come moments when nature makes a mere bank a means towards a fatal result." (p. 120.) This is taken from "*The Mill on the Floss*," and probably in its proper place has a direct bearing on the subject in hand. But as it stands in Mr. Main's pages, is simply a piece of nonsense. Considering the number of hunting men who have been killed by their horses putting their feet in a grip, it would be just as proper to say a ditch or a rabbit-hole, as a bank. So again Mr. Main gives us such a Tupperism as "We ought to strive that our affections be rooted in the truth," (p. 267), a sort of remark which we think we have seen in copybooks. Once more, Mr. Main, gives us as a "wise, witty, or tender saying"—"a man falling into dark waters seeks a momentary footing even on sliding stones," (p. 159), a remark which we also think we have seen before under the form of drowning men catching at straws. Of course Mr. Main does give us some valuable apothegms. This he could not well avoid, though he has done his best to spoil their value by his utter want of all order and arrangement. For the ordinary reader some notes and explanations are demanded, for the saying of Vauvenargues is peculiarly applicable to some of George Eliot's aphorisms—"Peu de maximes sont vraies à tous égards."

It is excessively difficult to account for the success of some books. "*Lord Bantam*"<sup>2</sup> has already gone through several editions. It has

<sup>2</sup> "*Lord Bantam*." By the Author of "*Ginx's Baby*." London: Strahan and Co. 1872.

been received by the press with pæans of delight. On what ground these praises have been bestowed we are at a perfect loss to conceive. As a novel it is beneath criticism. There is neither plot nor construction. There is not a character in the book, that is to say, anything approaching to the semblance of a human being. There are a number of personages, who are labelled with names, who, alternately with the author, rave and rant. What the meaning of the book is we have not the slightest conception. Nothing seems to please the author. He attacks everything right and left with clumsy ridicule. Now we have often said, that a novel is not the place for discussing social and political questions. If the author has anything to say about University Reform, Primogeniture, Chartism, Infidelity, Rights of Woman, or Darwinism, let him by all means write a treatise and give us his views. Under the guise of fiction, however, an author distorts facts and makes cowardly innuendoes against persons which he dares not put in a direct shape.

"Cruel as the Grave,"<sup>3</sup> if not very witty or brilliant, is certainly not dull. The authoress thoroughly knows the scenes which she describes. There is something of Mr. Trollope's style of writing in the book. Like Mr. Trollope, the authoress, if she never ascends to any great heights, yet at all events never falls into utter commonplace. She is strongest in her sketches. We should advise her, if she really wishes to write pure English, not to interlard her sentences with so many scraps of French, German, and Latin. To those who do not understand them they are annoying, whilst to those who do they are merely contemptible.

We are very much afraid that "The Old Maid's Secret"<sup>4</sup> will not have that popularity in England which the translator informs us it enjoys in Germany. The story wants action. The petty details weary, whilst the narrow-mindedness of Madame Hellwig, who occupies so large a space on the canvas, is perfectly repulsive. The tale, however, is not without some good points. The actress's daughter, Felicitas, is charmingly sketched. A thorough enjoyment of nature and country scenes pervades the story. Spring, summer, autumn, and even winter are described with loving enthusiasm. The address to May at p. 93 is conceived in the highest vein of true poetry.

"Sisters and Wives"<sup>5</sup> is, in our opinion, a great falling off from the writer's earlier production, "Citoyenne Jacqueline." She seems, if we may so speak, to be writing against the grain. Most of the early scenes are tame and flat, and it is not until we come to the married life of Mr. and Mrs. Duke that we feel any real interest in the story. Here we recognise some of the writer's touches. She evidently shines most in painting quiet domestic scenes. One of the best drawn cha-

<sup>3</sup> "Cruel as the Grave." By the Countess von Bothmer. Author of "Strong Hands and Steadfast Hearts," "A Poet Hero," &c. &c. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1872.

<sup>4</sup> "The Old Maid's Secret." By E. Marlitt. Translated from the German by H. J. G. Strahan and Co. London. 1871.

<sup>5</sup> "Sisters and Wives." By Sarah Tytler, author of "Citoyenne Jacqueline," "The Nut-Brown Maids," &c. &c. London: Smith, Elder and Co. 1871.

racters, with her kindly feeling and homely ways, is Old Sarah. Her conversation with Mrs. Duke about the state of her affairs in the second book is admirably done.

We must say, too, that we expected something better from Miss Maine than "Annie: an Excellent Person."<sup>6</sup> Miss Maine writes very sensibly upon a great number of subjects, but this is not enough. We want to be amused with a novel. We do not go to it to learn how to live upon two hundred a year, which is one of the problems started in the opening chapters. Besides, Miss Maine makes the fatal mistake of too often overpowering us with description, instead of setting the scenes dramatically before us by means of the actors themselves. We most sincerely trust that in her next novel Miss Maine will fulfil the promise which she gave us in "Among Strangers." It is certainly not from any want of ability that Miss Maine fails. Above all let her avoid a certain tendency to sermonizing, which is apt to degenerate into mere twaddle.

For the first time in our lifetime we have found Mr. Lever dull. That Lord Kilgobbin<sup>7</sup> is a failure is, we believe, pretty generally acknowledged. The old wit and humour flash out here and there, but it is only for a moment. Friendly criticism may for a time bolster up the book, and give it a certain circulation at the libraries. Reasons and excuses, too, may be plausibly put forward accounting for its dullness. When we first read its opening chapters in the pages of the *Cornhill Magazine*, we simply supposed that Mr. Lever was somehow affected by the spirit of that highly respectable but pre-eminently cautious serial, and was no longer permitted to enjoy the licence of fun and humour in which he revels in *Blackwood*. The best apology may, however, be found in Mr. Lever's own pathetic words in his dedication. There he tells us, what we most sincerely regret to learn, that these volumes were written "in breaking health and broken spirits." What it is to have to write a novel under such circumstances we need not say. We can, however, by no means sympathize with Mr. Lever's wish that "this effort may be my last." On the contrary we shall hope soon to see him with renewed strength and health disporting himself as of old in the congenial pages of *Blackwood's Magazine*. Mr. Lever is one of those opponents whom we can always meet on friendly terms, and from whom we can always learn much.

Judging by internal evidence we should suppose that "Perplexity"<sup>8</sup> is a first work, and that the author is, notwithstanding the name, a young lady who has not seen much of the world except through the medium of sensational novels. The style is far too violent and spasmodic for our taste, but we suppose that there are people who like this sort of thing. "Curse you!" I swore to him when he told me

<sup>6</sup> "Annie: an Excellent Person." By E. S. Maine. Author of "Among Strangers." London: Smith, Elder and Co. 1872.

<sup>7</sup> "Lord Kilgobbin. A Tale of Ireland in our Own Time." By Charles Lever, LL.D. Author of "The Bramleys of Bishop's Folly," &c. &c. London: Smith, Elder and Co. 1872.

<sup>8</sup> "Perplexity." By Sydney Mostyn. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1872.

the news on leaving the bank together. . . . . The old villain began to shed tears. 'Give me the keys!' I roared, 'I'll have my money!' At this he took to his heels,—I followed. Sixty as he is, he ran like a hare,—he flew, dodged, vanished." (vol. i. p. 151.)

"*Sister Martha*"<sup>9</sup> is a mere travesty of the war correspondence during the late war between Prussia and France, interwoven with a very badly told love story. There is, however, an account of a fight in the air between two balloons, which we do not remember to have heard of. It is a most remarkable affair. One balloon bears down upon the other, showing, what we did not know, that aerial navigation has been brought to perfection. Tremendous firing takes place. The German balloon is dashed to the earth, whilst the French balloon flies up into space. In his account of the different battles the author treats us to the very tallest talk. He never gives us a simple word if he can find us a grand one, and so resembles those French Academicians, who always used *palefroi* for *cheval*.

"*The Raven Club Papers*"<sup>10</sup> is a well intentioned stupid book. Its meaning, in part at least, is to expose the promoters of swindling companies, and to prevent the sheep offering themselves to the shearer. Its wit, however, is of the heaviest kind. We can only say of the book, what village nurses are accustomed to say when recommending their medicines—if it wont do any good it wont do any harm.

Mrs. Edward Millett's "*Australian Parsonage*"<sup>11</sup> is an extremely sensible and well written book on Western Australia, more especially dealing with Perth and Barladong, where she and her husband, a government chaplain, resided for five years. Her experience on board ship is given in a bright lively way. She makes the same remarks as others have done, as to the low standard of the single women sent out. She confirms also what we have before seen stated, that the agents of the Emigration Commissioners, if they do not actually mislead the poor emigrants as to the situation of the Swan River, at all events take very good care not to enlighten their ignorance. The consequence is, that a number of poor penniless wretches are landed at Perth, under the idea that they can easily get to Melbourne, or wherever else their friends may be, and find that they had far better remained in London. Hence are engendered the same bitter feelings against the government which the recruit at home feels when he has been made drunk by some dishonest recruiting-sergeant and enlisted as a soldier. It is high time that the attention of the government authorities was called to this crying evil. No good can ever come out of fraud. There seems, too, from Mrs. Millett's account (pp. 245, 246), to be just cause of complaint against the local government. If, for instance, an employer brought a charge of neglect of work against a ticket-of-leave holder, the man was not only sent to jail, but mulcted of all the wages due to

<sup>9</sup> "*Sister Martha: or a Romance of the Franco-Prussian War.*" By Benjamin Wilson. London: T. Cautley Newby. 1871.

<sup>10</sup> "*The Raven Club Papers.*" Edited by Nathaniel Nutgall. First Series. Second Edition. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer. 1872.

<sup>11</sup> "*An Australian Parsonage: or the Settler and the Savage in Western Australia.*" By Mrs. Edward Millett. London: Edward Stanford. 1872.



him. Such a law, Mrs. Millett adds, acts as a temptation to dishonest masters to pick a quarrel on any frivolous pretence, for the purpose of escaping the payment of wages. Equally infamous, too, is the truck system, the effects of which Mrs. Millett exposes. We cannot give in detail the hard oppression and the many miseries which result from its working, but we recommend all who are interested in the welfare of our colonies and our fellow human beings, to study what Mrs. Millett has written on the subject (pp. 246-248). Mrs. Millett rightly compares the atrocious truck system to that of slavery. And it is just now all-important to call attention to the evils of the system, as there are politicians, both in England and abroad, who openly advocate it, as they would also do slavery if they were not held in check by public opinion. We most sincerely thank Mrs. Millett for these pages on the subject. Her accounts of the natives, and their manners and customs, is particularly interesting. Their only idea of religion is worshipping a sort of devil, called "Jingy." "Jingy" appears in all sorts of shapes to the natives, now frightening them in the bush, now knocking at the doors of their huts (p. 79). The curlews, which fly a good deal by night, making a loud screaming noise, are consecrated to him, and are known as "Jingy Birds" (p. 58). A somewhat similar superstition, however, may be found at home, in the belief of our north-country peasants in "the Devil's Pack" or the Gabriel Hounds, which make the "Gabriel Ratchet," portending death to whoever hears them, and which are after all only flocks of wild ducks. The native Australian priests are called Bollia men, and appear to believe less in "Jingy" than anybody else. After a burial the Bollia men come to the grave to see if they can discover "Jingy's" footsteps. If his footsteps are seen, then the nearest male relative of the dead must go and kill some member of another tribe, so that the soul of the dead may have peace. Mrs. Millett appears to have converted a native child, whom she adopted. We must quote, for the benefit of that new sect which has lately sprung up in England, and believes in the resurrection of animals, one of Binnaham's remarks during the process of her conversion:—"Another time Binnaham asked if her dead brothers and sisters were gone to heaven, and being told that all innocent children would be there, she remarked, 'Little kangaroo do no harm—little kangaroo go too'" (p. 147). Mrs. Millett especially praises the climate of the Swan River, and above all the beauty of the sunsets, which may be illustrated by a remark of Binnaham's as she stood with Mrs. Millett watching the tints. "My cousin and me used to choose our frocks out of the sky" (p. 172). Consumption appears to be almost unknown. The natives suffer principally from measles and early loss of teeth. The last pages of Mrs. Millett's book are most valuable to all those who think of emigrating. In conclusion, the work is one which is especially fitted for the shelves of a parish library, and will do an immense deal of good by giving information to those who especially need it—the labouring class.

In our opinion the edition of "Pliny's Letters"<sup>13</sup> by Messrs. Church

<sup>13</sup> "Pliny's Letters." By the Rev. Alfred Church, M.A., Head Master of the Royal Grammar School, Henley-on-Thames; and the Rev. W. J. Brodribb, M.A., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. London: William Blackwood and Sons. 1872.

and Brodribb is one of the best chosen and best handled of any of the works in the Ancient Classics series. It is one of the best chosen for the simple reason that it deals with subjects, which in these days must interest every Englishman who travels to Italy. The most illiterate of Cook's Tourists, who takes a return ticket to Como, does not fail to pay a visit to the site of Pliny's villa, or if he goes to Naples, to bring back some photographs of Pompeii. Many of the Editors in this series seem to forget for whom they are writing. This, Messrs. Church and Brodribb never do. By some happy touch illustrating our own modern life, they realize the past to the most provincial understanding. Such an expression as "Baia the Brighton of Rome" (p. 12) will give a more vivid idea of Baia to a city man than pages of antiquarian learning. So, too, the comparison between the old Roman noble at his villa on the banks of Como,—though it requires some limitations,—and our own better class of squires, brings out the real character of Roman country life, consisting partly in an admiration of nature, and partly in a love of field sports (124). To all those who are going to Italy we say, by all means put this little volume into your trunks; and to all compilers of Italian guide-books, enrich yourselves, as far as the law allows, with quotations from Messrs. Church and Brodribb's pages.

We cannot say much in favour of the "Library Dictionary."<sup>13</sup> Its title page, of which we can only give a small portion, is as long as an ordinary preface. The performance, however, comes short of the promise. We have looked in vain for the following,—"seedness"—(sowing-time), "pugging" (thievish), "rampallion" (a term of abuse), "holding" (the burden of a song), "frampal" or "frampold" (peevish) and many others, all of which are to be found in Shakespeare. There is no excuse, too, for these omissions. The compiler can scarcely have consulted such a common work as Nares. Many of the derivations, too, are not up to the latest standard. As for the thousand woodcuts with which the work is illustrated, they, generally speaking, illustrate only the commonest things, such as lizards and lobsters.

Mr. Minto's "Manual of English Prose Literature"<sup>14</sup> is an admirable book, well-selected and well put together. It is evidently the result of much hard reading, which has been thoroughly digested. Mr. Minto gives us the idea of being, what we may venture to call, a full man. There is nothing superficial or showy about him. All here is good solid matter. He does not trust to the ordinary sources of information, nor passively give way to critics, however great their authority. He is thus in many places able to correct the opinions of such men as even Hallam, and Scott, the weight of whose names has given currency to views which convey a totally wrong impression upon

<sup>13</sup> "The Library Dictionary of the English Language, Etymological, Derivative, Explanatory, Pronouncing, and Synonymous," &c. &c. Illustrated by one thousand Engravings on Wood. London and Glasgow: William Collins, Sons, and Co. 1872.

<sup>14</sup> "A Manual of English Prose Literature. Biographical and Critical. Designed mainly to show Characteristics of Style." By William Minto, M.A. William Blackwood and Sons. London and Edinburgh. 1872.

many points connected with English literature. Further, Mr. Minto is peculiarly fair. His great object evidently is to do justice to each author, whatever political or religious views he may hold. If Mr. Minto has any particular leanings, we should say they were composed of the odd combination of a love of Scotchmen and a profound reverence for the English Church. His style, too, is excellent, clear and vigorous. He is evidently an admirer of satire, and he knows how to wield the lash. Here is an example. Speaking of Penn he thus writes: "In the later years of Charles and under James he was a great favourite at Court: his conduct there is assailed by Macaulay, and warmly defended by Paget and others." (p. 390). The "and others" will raise a smile with all those who know to whom the reference is made. It is nearly as good as Swift's allusion to Defoe: "the fellow that was pilloried, I forget his name." It deserves to be bracketed with Mr. Spedding's celebrated sarcasm on the same book-maker. Indeed, we think so highly of Mr. Minto's powers that we deeply regret that he has not kept more to the first part of the title of his book, instead of devoting so much time to such mere drudgery as teaching composition. We have no doubt that much may be done towards acquiring a style of accurate and correct writing. But that thing which we call style, can no more be taught a person, than painting or music can be taught one who has no gifts for either. Style, as Buffon said, is the man. We think, too, that Mr. Minto has devoted far too much space, nearly one-third of the whole book, to three writers of our own day, De Quincey, Macaulay, and Carlyle. Of the three, Carlyle is the only one who can be said to have in any way affected the views of our generation. In his case style is peculiarly the outcome of the man, and no one, we should suppose, would dream of adopting it. We much wish, instead of devoting so much labour to these three authors, that Mr. Minto had, by the help of the Halliwell, Collier, Arber, Pearson, Reeves and Turner, Ashbee and Grosart reprints, to say nothing of those by the various Societies, given us some account of our less known English writers. We looked in vain through Mr. Minto's index—which, by the way, ought to be made much fuller—for Nash, of whom Gifford, himself a master of satire, said, "he had a vein of caustic railery, never yet surpassed." All, however, that we can find about him is just four lines under Martin Marprelate (p. 268). At least twenty pages might with great advantage have been given both to him and Harvey. Mr. Minto, with his evident relish for satire, would have been thoroughly at home in dealing with them. So, too, Mr. Minto—partly, no doubt, from the narrow limits of the book—does injustice to Decker (pp. 273, 274). It conveys a totally wrong impression to say, that his productions are "burlesque satires of the extreme fashionable world, of the bucks and girls of the period" (p. 274). Such a description would be very applicable to some of Rowland's poetical works. On the other hand Decker has, in his "*Villainies Discovered by Lanthorne and Candle-light*" (1616), laid bare all the squalid misery and vice in the London of his day, and at Sig. H. 3 verso, and Sig. H. 4, has distinctly mentioned "baby-farming" and other evils which we have long considered to be the

peculiarity of our own age. As the Quarterly Reviewer, quoted by Lowndes, justly says, "The pamphlets and plays of Decker alone would furnish a more complete view of the habits and customs of his contemporaries in vulgar and middle life, than could easily be collected from all the grave annals of the times." We feel sure that if some recent writers on Elizabeth had studied the pages of Decker, they would not have given such a glowing picture of social order, decency, contentment, and happiness. Decker proves that exactly the reverse of all this was the case. We trust that Mr. Minto may be induced to give some fuller account of the lesser known Elizabethan prose writers. Better still would it be if he would begin another work on a different principle, simply confining himself to extracts from the authors, and illustrating them by those general literary criticisms which give his present work so much real value. We can now only in conclusion say, that his remarks on Lilly, and especially upon Arbutnot and Swift, are admirable. Mr. Minto thoroughly appreciates the irony of our greatest satirist. We think that he does not do justice to Milton, Mandeville, or "Junius;" but it would take us far too many pages to give our reasons for this opinion. We trust, however, that we have said enough to convince the reader that the book is in a general way sound, painstaking, and full of information, which can certainly be obtained nowhere else in so small a compass. We most strongly recommend it to the attention of all schoolmasters and schoolmistresses. We hope, too, to meet Mr. Minto again, when he will be able to do full justice to his undoubted critical powers and insight on a larger and more important scale, such as we have ventured to hint.

Our local printing presses, unlike those in Germany at the present time, or of France two hundred years since, seldom publish anything of value. Even the local almanack is now printed in London. Great credit is therefore due to Mr. Coward, the enterprising publisher of Carlisle, for the series of books in which the local manners and provincialisms of Cumberland are preserved. Mr. Richardson's "Cumberland Talk"<sup>15</sup> is a very good specimen of its class, but it unfortunately only appeals to a limited number of readers. The ordinary subscriber to Mudie's would not for a moment dream of even looking into it, and yet Mr. Richardson possesses far more ability than the generality of novelists who are so popular. To write in any particular dialect requires rare gifts. In the first place, a correct ear is necessary; in the next, a thorough knowledge of the idioms is required. These qualifications Mr. Richardson possesses, and adds to them literary powers of no mean order. His tales are distinguished by their healthy out-of-door tone, which is a characteristic of the literature of the north of England, and his poetry marked by kind feeling and good sense. We have only one fault to find with the book,—there is no glossary

<sup>15</sup> "Cumberland Talk. Being Short Tales and Rhymes in the Dialect of that Country. Together with a few Miscellaneous Pieces in Verse." By John Richardson, of Saint John's, Carlisle. London: John Russell Smith. 1871. Carlisle: George Coward.

Now, to the ordinary reader, "Cumberland Talk" is perfectly incomprehensible without some assistance. Further, those who are interested in the study of provincialisms would buy the work, not for the humour of the tales or the poetry, but simply for the sake of the glossary. The omission is especially to be regretted. Each year the old words are dying out. We sincerely trust that Mr. Richardson may be induced to take our hint, and give us not only a glossary to "Cumberland Talk," but a supplement containing the words omitted in the "Cumberland Dialects" (1839), or in Mr. Dickenson's and Mr. Gibson's works. He would thus earn the thanks of all philologists, and command a far greater number of readers than he can expect to do by his present work.

"Flowers and Gardens"<sup>16</sup> is a book of a very rare type. There are plenty of books upon flowers and upon gardens. Publishers know that books on these subjects sell, and care not what trash they put forth. The writers are generally utterly incompetent, and simply "vamp" up the text. Should they by some rare chance, however, be practical gardeners, they generally cannot put two sentences together. It is therefore a perfect surprise to meet with one who is a botanist, and can write with ease and grace. Dr. Forbes Watson, too, is a bold man. He dares to think for himself. In these days, when our gardens are turned into mere theatrical displays for a month or two in the summer, when the very borders and edgings are made of glazed Staffordshire tiles, when the paths are, so to speak, veneered with black and white and red patterns, when there is a rage for nothing else but "double" blossoms, when the good old flowers which our ancestors loved, and which our Elizabethan poets praised are denounced as vulgar, it is a real pleasure to meet with a man who admires simplicity. We little thought when we opened the book that we should find any one, who would boldly advocate planting apple trees in our gardens, and who would dare to say—"the finest dog-roses, I mean those which are the deepest pink, in many respects far surpass in colour the double garden roses," [pp. 177, 178]. And this is not a mere assertion, for Dr. Forbes Watson proceeds to justify the truth of his remarks, in words which every lover of nature will uphold. The great charm of the book is its thorough naturalness. We have gone astray from nature. Our gardeners have lately again taken to cropping our trees and shrubs into monstrous forms, like those brutes who used to crop our dogs' ears and tails. Everything is becoming artificial. We love monstrosities. Listen, however, to Dr. Forbes Watson on our double flowers:—"The fully-opened flower of the single peony is like the countenance of a living creature; that of the double has a form so vague and featureless that we might easily forget that it was a flower at all, and think that we were looking at a magnificent bunch of delicately-coloured ribbons" [pp. 184, 185]. Dr. Forbes Watson is by no means insensible to the colouring and dignity of double flowers, but he rightly perceives how often that colouring and dignity is gained by

<sup>16</sup> "Flowers and Gardens. Notes on Plant Beauty." By a Medical Man. London: Strahan and Co. 1872.

the sacrifice of other still more precious qualities. We cannot here go further into the subject, but would refer the reader to Dr. Forbes Watson's remarks at pp. 226-229. His criticisms are always admirable, whether he is dealing with colour or form. A better book for all persons interested in flowers and gardens there cannot be. It will lift them out of the old conventional ruts, and give them new and higher ideas of beauty. It is with deep concern that we learn that the book was written on a deathbed. With his great powers of description, his deep poetic vein of feeling, his accurate observation, and above all his originality and thorough independence of thought, Dr. Forbes Watson, had his life been spared, must have obtained a very high position as a writer on Nature.

We now come to a number of children's books, gleaming in blue, purple, crimson and gold. As far as we have been able to watch their effects, they act precisely as Sydney Smith says really good novels should—make children forget, not only the time, but their dinners. It is really wonderful the amount of ability which is now employed upon children's books. Here, for instance, is "*Lilliput Legends*,"<sup>17</sup> "got up" in an exquisite binding, good paper, clear type, and with an artistic care and excellence which a few years ago would only have been bestowed upon the works of some of the world's greatest poets. Nor are the contents unworthy of the outside. Both author and artist have done their best.

Equally good as "*Lilliput Legends*" is Mr. George Macdonald's "*The Princess and the Goblin*."<sup>18</sup> The author is known not merely as a novelist who holds a unique position, but as a poet of quaint grace and fancy. He has managed to unite his poetical fancies with a delicate and fantastic humour, which will we think have charms for others besides children. The authoress of "*Voyage en Zigzag*" requires no lengthy recommendation from us. The public are more stupid than we take them to be, if they wait for a reviewer's approbation before they buy such a book as "*The Children's Journey*."<sup>19</sup> It is not often that we go out of our way to praise poetry, but we cannot help saying that a little piece entitled "*Aus Himmel*," clearly proves that the authoress possesses poetic powers of no mean order. The stories, especially those relating to Christmas, are, like the illustrations which accompany them, charming. "*When I was Young*"<sup>20</sup> cannot for a moment be compared with either of the three foregoing works for imaginative power, but we have no doubt will be none the less welcomed by boys, for whom it would seem to be especially written. The writer, as may be seen from the chapter on Bird Nesting, evidently knows the country, and describes country scenes with enthusiasm. He

<sup>17</sup> "*Lilliput Legends*." By the Author of "*Lilliput Levee*." London: Strahan & Co. 1872.

<sup>18</sup> "*The Princess and the Goblin*." By George Macdonald, Author of "*At the Back of the North Wind*." London: Strahan & Co. 1872.

<sup>19</sup> "*The Children's Journey, and other Stories*." By the Author of "*Voyage en Zigzag*," &c. London: Strahan & Co. 1872.

<sup>20</sup> "*When I was Young*." By Charles Camden, author of "*The Boys of Axleford*," &c. &c. London: Strahan & Co. 1872.

evidently lives in an "old-world" part of England, if it be not Wales, for we are by no means certain; somewhere on the sea-coast, and thus finds plenty of scope for those sort of adventures which boys love. Shipwrecks, smugglers' holes, wonderful rabbit warrens, castles, haunted mills, are the principal themes of his book. Llangadam, if there be such a place, must be especially interesting—so interesting that we regret that the author has not more precisely informed us where it is, with its colony of Flemings and Devonshire men. Probably in another work he will give us further information, and describe for us some of those old country customs and superstitions and folk lore and word lore which he evidently knows so well. Should he, however, attempt this task—and he has many special qualifications for the work—he must not mix it up among fiction. The difficulty in the present book is to separate fact from mere romance.

Everybody who knows anything about birds knows Mrs. Hugh Blackburn.<sup>21</sup> She can not only draw birds, but can also draw admirable caricatures of men and women under the shapes of birds,—dandies with wattles and beard and spurs like cocks, and feathered knickerbockers like rough-legged buzzards. At page 15 there is drawing which shows how admirably Mrs. Blackburn, had she lived in Athens in the days of its drama, and printing and lithography then been invented, would have illustrated the "Birds" of Aristophanes. She has acted very wisely in bringing out her children's book, "The Pipsis," in a large quarto form. We have noticed that children, though they may like to read a story-book to themselves quietly in a corner, yet prefer to look with others at pictures, and so form a joint-stock company of criticism and laughter. There is still one more child's book<sup>22</sup> left on our list, which also deals with birds—ducklings, turkey-cocks, rooks, and starlings. We can only say that this is the book for the corner for quiet reading.

There are at least four notable reprints of poems. Foremost stands Mr. Horne's "Orion."<sup>23</sup> We are glad to see that Mr. Horne has prefixed an introduction explaining the scope and nature of this really great epic. "Orion," he writes, "the hero of my fable, is meant to present a type of the struggle of man with himself—i.e., the contrast between the intellect and the senses, when powerful energies are equally balanced. Orion is a man standing naked before Heaven and Destiny resolved to work as a really free agent to the utmost pitch of his powers for the good of his race" (pp. iv. v.). Mr. Horne then proceeds to show that though Orion is a dreamer of dreams, these dreams are noble, and tend to practical action, and that he finds his sole reward and happiness in "the consciousness of a well-worked

<sup>21</sup> "The Pipsis." By the author of "Caw! Caw!" Illustrated by H. B. Glasgow: James Maclehose. 1872.

<sup>22</sup> "Tappy's Chicks, and other Links between Nature and Human Nature." By Mrs. George Cupples. With Nineteen Illustrations. London: Strahan & Co. 1872.

<sup>23</sup> "Orion." An Epic Poem. In three Books. By R. H. Horne, Author of "The Death of Marlowe," &c. &c. Ninth Edition. London: Ellis & Green. 1872.

life" (p. vi.). When one reads of a poem conceived in so lofty a strain, one is not surprised to learn that the author never received a farthing for the first three editions; at a time, too, when novelists are coming thousands by vile sensationalism. This is the world's pay. There is no need, we trust, of pronouncing a formal eulogy on "*Orion*," as classic in its own way as Keats's "*Endymion*," teeming with a Shakespearian wealth of imagery, full of clear-cut scenes from nature, and idealized with lofty thoughts. Those who do not know "*Orion*," simply proclaim their own ignorance.

The next reprint which claims attention is Messrs. Strahan's handsome edition of the Poet Laureate's works.<sup>24</sup> Though our taste has naturally altered, and though we have not the same liking for those rather over-sweet and over-luscious poems in Tennyson's earlier manner, yet it is a real pleasure to see these old favourites of our youth in so handsome a dress. We think, however, that Messrs. Strahan might, at all events, have made both sides of the cover alike. There is a niggardly, poverty-stricken look thus given to the book which ill accords with the rest of the "getting-up." It looks like one of those banners at a theatre, only one side of which is real.

Mr. Locker's new edition of his "*London Lyrics*" is sure to be welcomed by a host of admirers.<sup>25</sup> Those, however, who are so unfortunate, or whose education has been so sadly neglected as not to know "*My Life is a—*," "*Geraldine's Boots*," and "*Aunt Prudence's Muff*," are advised by all means to make acquaintance with them. Of the new poems in the present collection we will merely say that they are quite equal to the old ones in delicate grace and bright humour. We do not think, however, that Mr. Locker was well advised to write the lines on "*Gerty's Glove*," sparkling as they are, considering that Ben Jonson has written so exquisitely on the same subject. We could wish, too, that Mr. Locker would at times be serious. We were sorry to read the lines "*At Hurlingham*" without finding a single word of protest against a sport which is more fit for savages than educated English gentlemen.

Mr. Shepherd<sup>26</sup> has done good service to all little boys and girls by reprinting Charles and Mary Lamb's delightful little volume of "*Poetry for Children*." It is wonderful that in these days of reprints the book should have been so long overlooked. The editor, too, has prefixed an interesting introduction, and in a few words of sensible criticism called attention not only to the fresh and healthy feeling of these poems, but also to their higher poetical merits.

Amongst books which do not want reprinting, and which the world will very willingly let die, is Mr. Shield's "*Death of Lucretius*."<sup>27</sup>

<sup>24</sup> "*The Works of Alfred Tennyson, Poet Laureate.*" Vol. I. Miscellaneous Poems. London: Strahan & Co. 1872.

<sup>25</sup> "*London Lyrics.*" By Frederick Locker. Fifth Edition. London: Strahan & Co. 1872.

<sup>26</sup> "*Poetry for Children.*" By Charles and Mary Lamb. Edited and prefaced by Richard Herne Shepherd. London: Basil Montagu Pickering. 1872.

<sup>27</sup> "*The Death of Lucretius.*" A Poem. By Joseph Shield. London: Provoost & Co. 1872.



He makes a long rambling statement in his preface that he does not intend to compete with Tennyson's poem on the same subject. Then why on earth does he write on the subject at all? Marsyas, in spite of his protests, certainly deserves to be flayed alive when he contends with Apollo. But seriously to punish such a book as Mr. Shield's "Death of Lucretius," would be like reviving the old law of hanging people who have committed suicide.

"Saint Abe and his Seven Wives"<sup>22</sup> may lay claim to many rare qualities. In the first place the author possesses simplicity and directness. To this he adds genuine humour and intense dramatic power. Lastly he has contrived to give a local flavour, something of the salt of the Salt Lake to his characters, which enables us to thoroughly realize them. We shall endeavour to illustrate these characteristics. His simplicity, directness, and ease of style may all be seen in his Invocation to Chaucer. The first portion of the verses have the true ring of our best Elizabethan poets when they wrote in the same metre, or of Keats in such poems as "Ever let the Fancy roam," "Souls of Poets dead and gone," and his "Robin Hood." Little could we expect such lines as these from America:—

"Maypole dance and Whitsun ale,  
Sports of peasants in the dale,  
Harvest mirth and junketting,  
Fireside play and kiss-in-ring,  
Ancient fun and wit and ease—  
Gone are one and all of these;  
All the pleasant pastime planned,  
In the green old Mother-land.  
Gone are these and gone the time  
Of the breezy English rhyme;  
Sung to make men glad and wise,  
By great bards with twinkling eyes:  
Gone the tale and gone the song  
Sound as nut-brown ale and strong."—p. vii.

We must say with Keats, when writing on the same subject, "No, those days are gone away." And he who now looks for Maypole dances, Whitsun Ales, and Bride Ales, might as well look for Robin Hood in Sherwood Forest. The change, however, from old English mirth to modern English sadness has been brought about in many ways. In the first place the Calendar has something to do with it. The first of May of our ancestors was thirteen days later than our own, which makes a great difference as far as out of door sports are concerned in a climate like ours. In the next place machinery has played an important part in reducing the element of fun. It is impossible to feel that enthusiasm over the labours of a steam-plough or a reaping-machine as over your own. The introduction, too, of such beverages as tea and coffee have not been without their effect. But we are inclined to think that this old English mirth and jollity has been greatly exaggerated. Certainly we find nothing to corroborate

---

<sup>22</sup> "Saint Abe and his Seven Wives. A Tale of Salt Lake City." London: Strahan & Co. 1872.

the accounts of recent sentimental historians, as to the happy social condition of the people in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth. Every contemporary work on the subject refutes the statement, and reveals an enormous amount of squalid misery, disease, and suffering among the lower orders. Generally speaking, too, as far as we have observed human nature, loud laughter and high spirits go hand in hand with a coarse and unreflecting mind, whilst sorrow has from the days of Solomon been associated with increase of knowledge. We are therefore very well content to accept the author's concluding sneers, which we need not quote, as to our modern English sadness, and to reflect that had he thought a little more on the subject his verse might not have run quite so easily and so flippantly as it does. And here seems to be the author's weakness and danger in the future. He writes with a fatal facility. "Saint Abe and his Seven Wives" is very unequal. There are charming passages, such as we have quoted, followed by the most prosaic bits. To pass on, however, to the author's humour. His hits are particularly good. He knows how to point his barbs. Here is a piece worthy of the author of *Tartuffe*—Joe Wilson's Mormon receipt for converting women:—

"Don't talk of flesh and blood and feeling,  
But Holy Ghost and blessed healing;  
Don't name things in too plain a way,  
Look a heap warmer than you say;  
Make 'em believe they're serving true  
The Holy Spirit and not you:  
Prove all the world but you's damnation,  
And call your kisses jist salvation."—p. 15.

But what we have ventured to call the salt of the book lies in the picture which is given of Mormon life and views, expounded by the prophet and a chorus of wives. Generally speaking, Mormon views, like the flavour of the mango, will not bear exportation. It is difficult to write about Priapus in a decent Christian way. But the author has overcome this hitherto insuperable obstacle in a manner which is as dramatic as it is humorous. We will not spoil the admirable canto "Within the Synagogue" by any quotation, which, however long, cannot possibly do it justice. We will merely say that this one bit is worth the price of the whole book. In the author of "Saint Abe and his Seven Wives" we recognise a true poet, with an entirely original vein of humour.

We think that the author of "Hymns of Modern Man"<sup>29</sup> has made a great mistake in committing his views on religion and other matters into verse. Had he given the world his opinions in the shape of essays, we believe that he might have found a wide audience and enlisted many sympathies on his side. There can be no doubt that views such as Mr. Noyes holds would, if expressed in prose, command at the present moment considerable attention. The time never was so ripe for enunciating them. But unless poetry is first-rate, no one

---

<sup>29</sup> "Hymns of Modern Man." By Thomas Herbert Noyes, B.A. Author of "An Idyll of the Weald." London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1872.

will read it; and many will consequently turn away repulsed from the present little volume, who would have certainly been attracted by it had the thoughts been expressed in prose.

"The Margaret Sonnets"<sup>30</sup> are privately printed. They possess certain beauties which give the book a character of its own. The first sonnet is particularly lovely. The description is very delicate. There is quite a Pre-raphaelite beauty in the way in which the writer describes the first tender leaves of the ash and the willow, and the pink elm-flowers which strew the road, and the chestnut still "half concealed in flowers," and, above all, the oak-leaves, amber in the spring sunshine, still, as he says, "untanned by summer suns, unbruised by showers." And the same intense love of Nature and delicacy of treatment may be found equally conspicuous in many of the other sonnets. But, unfortunately, the author harps too much on one string. The reader is soon surfeited. Only Petrarch and Shakspeare can interest us by a series of sonnets on a single theme. The sonnet, too, is still far from popular in England, notwithstanding that the greatest of our poets have always delighted to do it honour. For these reasons we are afraid that the author would not meet with that recognition from the general public, which is certainly his due, should he think of giving his sonnets to the world at large.

"Hymns of Life"<sup>31</sup> is a collection of poetry, with music, on all sorts of subjects—"Duty," "Faith," and "The New Bethlehem." The author shows a most catholic taste. He quotes alike from Sir H. Wotton and Mrs. Barbauld, from Tennyson and Tupper, from the Psalms of David and Eliza Cook. St. Paul and Schiller are jumbled up with Charles Swain and "W. H. Timrod." This is the fault of all these sort of books. The compiler seems to possess not the slightest critical power. One piece of poetry, as long as it rhymes, is as good to him as another. As was said of Izaak Walton, he can evidently put "God and gudgeon into the same sentence."

With regard to the other volumes of poetry on our table, little can be said. Many of them are very pretty, and have evidently given the authors great pleasure in writing them, but whether they will give any one else the same feeling is very doubtful. Two volumes<sup>32</sup> show at least an unusual amount of cultivation and power of translation. But if an author wishes to make his mark as a translator, he must do far more than give us a few select pieces culled here and there. Down-right hard labour is perhaps more required from a translator than from a coalheaver. It is very pleasant, doubtless, for any idle gentleman to take down his Catullus and translate some favourite passage; but the public very rightly pays no attention to such amateur work. One or two more volumes,<sup>33</sup> especially "Aldornere," an American story, which

<sup>30</sup> "The Margaret Sonnets." Private Issue. London. 1872.

<sup>31</sup> "Hymns of Life, for Human Encouragement." Edited by H. W. Smith. Music selected and arranged by W. Hatley. Edinburgh: Thomas Laurie. 1872.

<sup>32</sup> I. "Childs Malverne: a Fragment, and other Poems." London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1872. II. "The Wanderings of Aletes, and other Poems." By Matthew of Gower. London: Williams & Norgate. 1872.

<sup>33</sup> I. "Aldornere." A Pennsylvanian Idyll. Illustrated with nine original Etch-

is very prettily illustrated, show a love for nature, and a quiet pensive tone. Whether the authors will ever succeed in achieving anything higher it is impossible to say. Some volumes are in places nearly unintelligible, and must, we feel sure, have given the authors a great deal of pain to have written them. Here is an example from Mr. Norton's "Hermit"<sup>34</sup> :—

"Does He whose idea creation is  
Punish divergence with meet temporal ill,  
Wherein the soul, changed in some element,  
Regains faith's focus, pre-own'd recognition?"—p. 44.

Surely there ought to be some note to explain the esoteric meaning of this to the average reader. The same sort of objection lies against a portion of Mr. Collingwood's very elaborate poem "A Vision of Creation."<sup>35</sup> It has been well said that if Milton had lived in the nineteenth century he would have entirely remodelled his scheme of the creation of the world. We cannot possibly go into Mr. Collingwood's views. We will merely say that all discussions on such subjects seem to us far better suited for prose than verse. Below will also be found the name of a book<sup>36</sup> which is supposed to contain poetry.

Many years ago we saw a translation of Halm's "Griseldis."<sup>37</sup> Whether this is the same we cannot pretend to say. Unfortunately the translator, Mr. Sieg, does not give us a line of either introduction, preface, or notes. We are left to grope our way in the dark. Many readers will be puzzled to know whether it really is the old story of "Patient Grissell," concerning whom Haughton, Chettle, and Decker wrote their "pleasaunt comedie." Some notice should have been taken of previous versions of the story, and of Halm's special treatment of an unpleasant subject. We have no copy of Halm by us, but can say that the present translation is very fluent and readable.

Mr. Leland has given us a translation of a large portion of Scheffel's "Gaudeamus,"<sup>38</sup> together with some other German student songs. In spite of the high praise which Mr. Leland bestows upon Scheffel's

ings by Lloyd Mifflin, Philadelphia. 1872. II. "Village Life and Sketches, with other Poems." By W. Watman Smith. London: Trübner & Co. 1871. III. "The Legend of Phyllis, with a Year of Song." By William Sawyer, Author of "Ten Miles from Town." Illustrated by John Proctor. London: Longmans, Green, Reader & Dyer. 1872.

<sup>34</sup> "The Hermit." A Poem, and Miscellaneous Verse. By Thomas Norton. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1872.

<sup>35</sup> "A Vision of Creation." A Poem. By Cuthbert Collingwood, M.A., F.L.S., &c. With an Introduction Geological and Critical. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1872.

<sup>36</sup> "Cæsar in Britain." A Poem in Five Cantos. By Thomas Kentish. London: Basil Montagu Pickering. 1872.

<sup>37</sup> "Griseldis." A Drama. Translated from the German of Fr. Halm. By W. M. Sieg. London: Trübner & Co. 1872.

<sup>38</sup> "Gaudeamus." Humorous Poems. Translated from the German of Joseph Victor Scheffel and others. By Charles G. Leland. London: Trübner & Co. 1872.

geological songs, we think there is nothing so exquisitely humorous to be found in them as Bishop Shuttleworth's "Specimen of a Geological Lecture." One of the best is—

"Im schwarzen Wallfisch zu Ascalon,  
Da trank ein Mann drei Tag',  
Bis dass er steif wie ein Besenstiel  
Am Marmortische lag."

So at least stands Mr. Leland's version, but in the one which we have heard in Germany the second line runs, "Da kneipt ein Mann drei Tag'," which is far more expressive and student-like. And if any English reader should be puzzled with "kneipt," we should advise him to look in the "Allgemeine Deutsche Studentsprache" under Kneipe and Kneipen, where the terms are fully explained. "Steif wie ein Besenstiel," we may add, has its exact equivalent in the North of England, in the phrase "drunk as a besom," or, as Mr. Atkinson in his excellent "Cleveland Glossary" gives it, "as fond as a besom." The other student songs with which Mr. Leland closes the volume are all translated with equal humour and spirit. In the well-known one of "Der lustige Bruder," who, like Kit Sly, possessed more feet than shoes, we perceive that Mr. Leland has contrived to throw into the last stanza an additional touch of humour. Altogether the present volume may be strongly recommended to English readers, and will go a long way to disprove the often made assertion that the Germans possess no humour.

All those who know the Odenwald, and who have been along the Bergstrasse from Darmstadt to Heidelberg, will read with interest the first story in Auerbach's "Zur Guten Stunde."<sup>30</sup> The story is characteristically German both in its strength and its weakness. The opening scene introduces us on a Saturday evening to the little village of S——, which is decked out with flags and garlands. Three strangers are talking in front of the Golden Lion with the landlord. The landlord is of the usual type, with a smirk in his face and a napkin in his hand. He informs the strangers that the village is decked out in its best for a gala to-morrow, when a presentation of colours and a meeting of choral societies take place. The friends, whose names are Berger, Günther, and Max, have a slight difference about staying, but eventually remain. The opening scenes in the morning, the old castle ruins crowned with woods, and the singing, are described with deep poetical feeling. The burgomaster presents the colours in due form. The whole company sing Goethe's "Nachtlied"—"Ueber allen Gipfeln ist Ruh'." Günther, who by the way is a professor, suddenly remembers that to-day is the twenty-eighth of August—Goethe's birthday. A happy thought strikes him. The choral society at S—— shall be called after Goethe. The Herr Professor makes a most glowing idealistic speech. He thoroughly convinces Max, who has shown throughout the proceedings a rather contumacious spirit. The

---

<sup>30</sup> "Zur guten Stunde." Von Berthold Auerbach. Stuttgart: Carl Hoffman. 1872.

penitent man presents the choral society with a bust of Goethe, hobnobs with the village schoolmaster, and everything ends as it should, everybody swearing eternal friendship for everybody. Now a story like this, with its poetical descriptions of the Odenwald, with the Herr Professor's laudations of German song and German *geist*, is likely enough to be true in Germany, and it is quite sure also to be popular. But transpose the facts to England. Imagine three gentlemen, one of whom is an Oxford professor, going down to the High Peak, keeping up a running fire of commentary on its beauties and the Progress of Humanity. The three reach a Peak village, where the "wakes" are being kept. The Oxford Professor suddenly remembers that it is the twenty-third of April—Shakspeare's birthday. He forthwith addresses the boors, who of course at the mention of Shakspeare's name take off their hats, and goes off amidst the sympathy of the audience into a flight of transcendental philosophy. To us such a story would appear to be very improbable. Germans constantly complain that we criticise their novels from an utterly wrong point of view. We believe, too, that such is the case. We have endeavoured to show the cause, by transferring the main facts of this very pretty and interesting sketch to English ground.

We cannot say much in favour of "Erna."<sup>40</sup> It is one of those terribly sentimental novels which German young ladies appear to like so much. The stage properties of them are all the same—love, stars, and moonshine. We need do no more than announce the second edition of Adolph Stahr's "Weimar and Jena,"<sup>41</sup> which is already so well-known in England. The edition of the same author's miscellaneous writings is also sure to find a welcome. The first volume<sup>42</sup> before us is confined to biographical notices. One of the most interesting is that upon Lamennais. Herr Stahr saw him twice in 1850, and gives us a most minute account of him. Lamennais was then nearly seventy, and with his thin, bent form, his small, sharp, delicate features, and his rather antiquated dress, reminded Herr Stahr more of the men of the last generation than of the present. The rest of the essay is devoted to a criticism on Lamennais and his works. Herr Stahr does not forget, when touching on the strong Conservatism of Lamennais, to quote Paul Louis Courier's saying, that if Lamennais had been present at the creation of the world, he would have said, "Mon Dieu ! conservons le chaos !"

---

<sup>40</sup> "Erna, oder Ich habe gelebt und geliebet." Ein Seelengemälde. Von T. S. Braun. Leipzig : F. W. Grunow. 1872.

<sup>41</sup> "Weimar und Jena." Von Adolf Stahr. Zweite sehr vermehrte Auflage. Berlin : J. Gutentag. 1871.

<sup>42</sup> "Kleine Schriften zur Literatur und Kunst." Von Adolf Stahr. Erster Band. Biographisches. Berlin : J. Gutentag. 1871.

## ART.

**H**ERR OVERBECK is one of the most industrious of his industrious race. Every reader who has any acquaintance with "art science" as the Germans have constituted it, with the enormous contributions which German industry is continually making to comparative archæology and accurate art-history, knows the name of Herr Overbeck as one of the most copious and untiring among such contributors. His "*Schriftquellen*," or comprehensive collection of original references and classical passages bearing upon the history of ancient art and artists, is a book of permanent and serious value to the student. His "*History of Greek Art*," not long since completed in two quarto volumes, is a laborious and not unintelligent compilation from these and from more modern sources; but has, like so much of the work done by his countrymen in the same field, the fault of being inspired chiefly by the literature of the monuments and not of the monuments themselves—not, or very partially, by "*eigene Autopsie*" as a German says. Now it is possible for ever to go on multiplying, with labour and not without intelligence, comprehensive second-hand compilations of this kind, and adding to what Herr Overbeck justly acknowledges to be the already appalling bulk which the literature of a much-explored subject has reached. And in most if not all of the new compilations some grain of added fact, or at the least some new hypothesis worth thinking about, will be found included. But human patience and the capacities of the student have their limits; and these perpetual retravellings of the ground for the sake of some problematical gain or discovery are not what we want. If they are encouraged, if they are repeated as the last twenty years has witnessed their repetition in Germany, the subject will grow literally unmanageable and impossible. What is to be desired is that books should only increase and multiply in proportion to the real increase of our knowledge; that labourers in special fields should, by all means, issue monographs giving the result of their labours, when they have a definitive result, in as short a compass as possible; but that only a very specially chosen and specially gifted spirit should at very rare intervals attempt the vast task of a general re-presentation of the subject. For one so chosen and gifted, at the stage which the comparative mythology and the comparative art-history of the Greeks have reached at the hands of specialists in our day (though indeed the latter, at any rate, is still much more full of hypothesis in particulars than many of its professors would admit) a good, and perhaps the best, plan upon which to lay down the lines of his work would be to take the leading figures of mythology one by one, and follow them through the historical development of the various conceptions and the various situations which are proper to each conception, in which artists thought of and represented them. That is Herr Overbeck's plan in the new book<sup>1</sup> of which an immense first instalment was last

<sup>1</sup> "*Griechische Kunstmythologie*." Von J. Overbeck. Besonderer Theil. Erster Band: Erstes Buch: Zeus. Leipzig: Engelmann. 1871.

year laid before his readers. He will take each god in succession, and give a classified descriptive catalogue of every known representation of him or her that occurs in round sculpture, relief, fresco painting, vase painting, coin stamping, and gem engraving, in all the published and unpublished museums and antiquarian collections of Europe. The task is a colossal one. The first volume of 600 quarto pages comprises only the one arch-divinity Zeus; the next is only to comprise Here, Poseidon, and Demeter. Herr Overbeck has vigorously, and as far as we are able to test his labours exhaustively, ransacked all monographs and catalogues for his purpose. He has begun with a history of the development of the normal and central artistic ideal of Zeus in Greek art, and then classified the representations of him into—1, those which represent this normal ideal; 2, those which represent it modified by special or local attributes and forms of worship; 3, those which represent the personage of the god engaged in the various, (and naturally principally the amorous), episodes of his mythological character and career. And each of these classes contains such subclasses as the reader can suppose. And each particular instance is described minutely and at length in the text. There is the fault of the scheme. Verbal description, were it more picturesque than Herr Overbeck's is, can give little idea of minute differences in closely analogous works of art, and is for most purposes thrown away in the attempt. If every single known piece is to be published (and an exhaustive science of the subject may perhaps demand this among its data) let it be by pictorial illustration, so that the eye can at once take in shades and differences, and not by verbal description. Let a vast universal picture book of antiquities be produced, as well drawn as can be got, and classified, if you please, on the present principle, and we shall be grateful. And when the historian arises having these materials at his command, and with adequate personal grasp of his subject and insight into it, he will take for his description, for his exposition, not each item of the materials severally, but the proper, salient, and important types from among the multitude presented to him. Herr Overbeck reverses this process; he catalogues all things and illustrates a few—illustrates them in lithographs placed at the end of the volume, to which it is just to give their merit of very delicate execution and pleasant appearance. The consequence of this and of other causes we have indicated, will be that his laborious book, if it ever attains completion, will be in danger of simply cumbering, like so many others, the ground over which it is designed for a guide. The author seems to have some suspicion that his pains may be thought superfluous or misdirected, and the tone of his preface is in some degree apologetic.

Dr. Meyer, of Munich, gives us a more portable and happier example of the investigating habit of his nation in his "*Life of Correggio*,"<sup>2</sup> reprinted (with considerable additions) from the article in the forthcoming new edition of Nagler's "*Künstler-lexicon*," of which he is editor in chief. There may be something yet more to be done for Correggio in the way of literary and imaginative appreciation, of

<sup>2</sup> "*Correggio*." Von Julius Meyer. Leipzig: Engelmann. 1871.



criticism in that sense; but there can scarcely remain anything more to be done after this in the way of research, biography, and cataloguing. Dr. Meyer has not found much new material of importance, few positive additions to the attenuated biography of his hero. But he has been able conclusively to dispel a good many of the myths which hung round the name, and which, on the strength of the great master's provincial career and comparative obscurity among his contemporaries, as well of the spendthrift and degenerate ways of his ne'er-do-well son and grandson, attributed to his own life a gloom and impoverishment for which there is not one jot of substantial evidence. On the contrary, it is clear that he lived a careful life of busy employment although moderate rewards; and we like him the better for knowing that its one great shadow was the loss of his wife, which had the effect of spoiling his work and interfering with his industry for a time. On the whole, however, the productiveness of his brief forty years' career must be pronounced immense, especially for one who seems to have had little help from pupils. We should not be disposed to set much weight on the conclusions drawn by Dr. Meyer as to personal temperament from the evidence of work and its style—to feel sure, as his biographer does, that the *allegrezza* which is the work as well as the name of Antonio Allegri ("de Allegris," or "Lætus," as he sometimes punningly wrote it) was also a part of his habitual character. Correggio knew something certainly about *allegrezza* in looks and movements; and the inward smile of ravishment and pure gaiety for which his angels and cherubs are famous, he must have seen somewhere. But it is not safe to argue that the gaiety which he knew was his own, when a better authenticated biography assures us, for instance, what a melancholy personage resided behind the laughing images of Watteau's pencil. One of the most satisfactory of the chapters of Dr. Meyer's book, which refers to the art of the master, is that where he proves his early residence at Mantua, and the direct influence which the hardy perspective and superb cupola decorations of Mantegna had upon the art of this softer master. Other excellent chapters are those which deal with the nature and vicissitudes of Correggio's posthumous reputation in criticism, from the sixteenth century to our own day, and with his artistic influence on the imitators of the decadence—Cigoli, Cristofano Allori, and the rest, with Barroccio for the leader of the train. The concluding portions of Dr. Meyer's book are filled with discussions and descriptions of existing and lost, certainly authentic and probably authentic, doubtful and spurious, pictures of the master disseminated throughout Europe; and finally with a catalogue of the series of engravings published after his works. No pains have been spared in making the documentary as well as the intrinsic evidence on these matters as complete, according to the writer's resources, as it could be made. It may be just mentioned, to show how the utmost and most scholarly pains may sometimes fail in little things, that Dr. Meyer, writing of copies in England, calls Lord Dudley still Lord Ward, and has fallen into the error of confounding the Stafford House with the Bridgewater House collection.

Herr von Betberg is one of the many patriotic amateurs whom

the occasion of the Dürer festival incited to the composition of an appropriate tribute, and who was delayed in his publication by the events of 1870-71. His book,<sup>3</sup> which was written nearly two years ago, has been published less than one. It is a strange performance, of which the eccentricity, however, does not diminish the value which it has in certain special points. Herr von Retberg does not believe in the most experienced or acute "subjective impressions" as any criterion of authenticity, date, or excellence in a work of art, and trusts entirely to evidences which seem to him objective, precise, and circumstantial. If the æsthetic faculty in Herr von Retberg's neighbours were like his own, he, having that assurance, would be right to distrust it generally. Where that faculty comes at all in play into his account of Dürer's plates the result is paradoxical and unilluminating to a curious degree. But the merit of what he has done lies in a minute, microscopical, and, for the majority, uninteresting kind of technical *expertise*. He has carefully compared and noted the whole series of Dürer's works on wood and copper, and different states of each plate where they exist, with an eye to the paper on which they are printed, its water-mark, and minor technical points of that kind, which affect questions of date and authenticity. His aim is thus to supplement, or rather to amend and often reverse, the work of Bartsch and Heller. He gives numbers and a sequence of his own to the pieces. The least satisfactory or valuable part of his work is the largest part—the catalogue according to the classification of date. Here many dates are altered, and many assumptions made, summarily and without cause shown; and here occur without explanation some of those paradoxical descriptions to which we demur. The most valuable part consists of cross classifications according to other divisions, which are useful enough for reference—classifications according to the nature of the evidence of authenticity, according to the method or material, according to the paper-mark of the proof plates, according to the subject, and more yet.

Formidable indeed is the list of the veteran Dr. Karl Simrock's philological and other labours, as appended at the head of the last of them<sup>4</sup>—his modernized reprint of the solemn satire of the learned, much-talked-of and little-read jurist of Strasburg. The philological task of turning Sebastian Brand's obsolete language into modern High German and his Romance metres into Teutonic ones, is of a piece with so many still more difficult, which this great reviver and popularizer of all stages of his country's old literature has accomplished with credit. What concerns us here, however, is not the philology but the art—the pages decorated with an accurate reproduction (according to one of the modern processes, we presume, or possibly by new blocks copied from the ancient cuts) of the designs which accompanied the original

<sup>3</sup> "Dürer's Kupferstiche und Holzschnitte: ein Kritisches Verzeichniss." Von R. von Retberg. Munich: Ackermann. 1871.

<sup>4</sup> "Sebastian Brand's Narrenschiff, in neuhochdeutscher Uebersetzung." Von Karl Simrock: mit den Holzschnitten der ersten Ausgaben und dem Bildniss Brands aus Reusners Icones. Berlin: Lipperhede. 1872.

editions of the work ; also the life-like and characteristic portrait of the shrewd precisian and homely common-sense moralist, copied from Reusner's "Icones." Nobody will be likely to read the emblems and apoloques of the Ship of Fools through, even in the easily intelligible form which Dr. Karl Simrock has given them ; but many may be glad to dip into them, looking at the quaint cuts and borders as they go. These are said, at least the subject cuts, to have been dictated, or indeed sketched, by Brand himself, and are thus almost as much the work of his own mind as the verses which they illustrate. They were cut by four or five different hands in styles of different merit, some of a great deal, and others of very little, as to firmness and drawing power, but all naturally showing the influence and atmosphere of the schools of illustration created in Southern Germany between Holbein and Dürer towards the close of the fifteenth century. The simple woodcuts have often the rough Teutonic force of invention and expression in perfection, and are as entertaining to look at as need be. Though the landscape backgrounds are sometimes strikingly composed in the manner of Dürer, there is of course in these essentially German productions little attempt at or approximation to beauty of any kind ; only a hearty force of character and shrewd vigour of dramatic expression. The Fool who prefers the bagpipes to the harp and mandoline (without offence to our Scotch friends), the Fool who brings hawk and dog to church, the Fool out hunting with bugle and spear—these are examples of the best kind of work which the book affords.

Another illustrated quarto which Germany sends us this year is the amiable "Jeremias Gotthelf's" collection of national tales "Aus dem Bernerland," in an edition decorated with illustrations in wood, both large and small, from the hands of G. Roux, Fr. Walthard, and A. Anker. It is a pleasant though rather cumbrous story-book in this form ; and the illustrations, having the ordinary German qualities of correct drawing and quiet style, call for no special remark.

Dr. Lübke,<sup>6</sup> a worker more prolific than profound, is bringing out in due course, part by part, a fifth edition of Kügler's well-known Hand-book. The publishers allege their policy of endeavouring to keep the work still a standard one by entrusting a competent editor to add to or amend it at all points where subsequent research has created the necessity for such action. That is, we should say, an undertaking almost too large for the present editor's powers ; and in the part which is under our eyes we note several points where both information and criticism seem still allowed to lag a little behind the hour. Kügler's general summary, although so successful and, as the publishers justly put it, *epochemachend und bahnbrechend* in its day, was never a really satisfactory book, and cannot be made so. Still to those who have not the means of acquiring Schnaase's much more elaborate and much more valuable history in its new edition superintended by

\* "Aus dem Bernerland." Von Jeremias Gotthelf. Pracht-Ausgabe, mit Illustrationen von J. Roux, Fr. Walthard, und A. Anker. Berlin. 1872.

<sup>6</sup> "Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte." Von Franz Kügler ; fünfte Auflage, bearbeitet von Dr. Wilhelm Lübke : zweite Lieferung. Stuttgart : Ebner und Seibert. 1871.

Friedrichs and others, Dr. Lübke's edition of Kügler may still be recommended as probably presenting to the student the most sensible general view of the enormous field over which it ranges.

A learned curator in Dresden, writing in French and (as his list of publishing agents would seem to show) for the benefit of the amateurs of all nations, supplements a valuable previous *Guide to Amateurs of Porcelain and Pottery*,<sup>7</sup> with the present general collection of monograms, to help collectors of all minor objects or bric-à-brac whatever—monograms of sculptors, bronze carvers and wood carvers, ivory carvers, enamellers, armourers, jewellers, medal-sinkers, and others belonging to the age of the Renaissance and Rococo. Dr. Graesse has been indefatigable in copying down, and his type-maker and engraver, it would seem, creditably careful in reproducing, the marks and monograms on all the objects and curiosities which have passed under his eye in a situation where opportunity has matched predilection. For its speciality his little book cannot but be of immense service, and indeed stands alone; it would take an experience equal to its compiler's to make sure of there being no faults or failures in the task of transcribing so many scarcely differing marks, and the still more difficult one of identification between the marks and their owners.

The history of the Gothic Revival in England<sup>8</sup> is scarcely to be adequately written on the scale or with the pains that Mr. Eastlake has devoted to the task. He expressly speaks of his work having had to be done mainly in moments of leisure; and the result holds, towards a subject which is most interesting and next door to a great one, much more the place of a sketch or introduction than of what should really be called a history. Mr. Eastlake has made himself acquainted with all the more ordinary facts and publications bearing upon the æsthetic movement which he describes; he has collected the materials of some agreeable illustration from living architects; he has his own pretty decided predilection for the school of architecture which gives him its subject; he has a kindly and impartial admiration or toleration for his fellow-workers in the same profession; and with these endowments, and from this point of view, he gossips over the ground gently and not without instruction for the uninformed. In a word, it is a pleasant and capital popular book, saying nothing that it ought not to say, but quite without original light, or value as breaking up the deeper ground beneath artistic changes of this kind. Mr. Eastlake's own architectural orthodoxy seems pretty much a matter of routine; and he does not write like a man who has thought out the reasons of his beliefs or admirations for himself, and who has therefore something worth hearing to say of such spiritual phenomena as are connected with the subject under his hand. These are really profoundly interesting; and a reflective study of these, their progress and issues, as well as a more independent appreciation of various styles and a less

<sup>7</sup> "Guide de l'Amateur d'Objets d'Art et de Curiosité; ou Collection des Monogrammes, &c." Par Théodore Graesse, second directeur du Grün Gewölbe, &c., à Dresde. Dresden: Schoenfeld. 1871.

<sup>8</sup> "A History of the Gothic Revival." By Charles L. Eastlake, F.R.I.B.A. London: Longmans. 1872.

proclivity to innocent commonplace, are gifts needed in the writer who shall give us a serious and reasoned account of the movement of which we have here but a tea-table sketch.

Messrs. Bickers publish by way of gift-book<sup>9</sup> a reprint of some fables with their head and tail pieces, chosen from the earliest period of the great English wood-draughtsman's career and production, and prefaced with some remarks by Mr. Edwin Pearson, written in a singularly clumsy style, but full of what reads like carefully gleaned information as to Bewick's earlier career. The book might have been better got up, and there is a strange contrast between the simple taste and rough force of Bewick's style—so masterly in itself, so typical of whatever was best and freshest in the English art of a hundred years ago—and the regulation attractions of a publisher's Christmas exteriors in the nineteenth century. But one is glad, beneath whatever exterior and with whatever shortcomings, of the chance of putting this true and manly work into the hands of any section of the public to whom it is strange.

The "Picture Gallery"<sup>10</sup> is a periodical recently started, and adds one to the numerous forms in which art-popularizing publishers have availed themselves of the resources of the new processes of permanent photographic printing. Each part contains four Woodbury-types after pictures, drawings, or carvings of our modern school, moderately well chosen, as far as can yet be judged, and accompanied with moderately good comments or quotations.

---

<sup>9</sup> "Bewick's Select Fables." London: Bickers and Son. 1872.

<sup>10</sup> "The Picture Gallery" for January and February, 1872. London: Sampson Low.

# INDEX.

*All Books must be looked for under the Author's name.*

- "ABE, Saint, and his Seven Wives, a tale of Salt Lake City," 584
- Adams, W. H. D., "The Men at the Helm: Biographical Sketches of great English Statesmen," 570
- Aitken, William, M.D., "The Science and Practice of Medicine," 546
- "Aldonere, a Penusylvanian Idyll," 586
- "Aletes, the Wanderings of, and other Poems," by Matthew of Gower, 586
- Allbut, T. Clifford, M.D., "On the use of the Ophthalmoscope in Diseases of the Nervous System and of the Kidneys," 246
- Allman, George James, M.D., "A Monograph of the Gymnobiastic, or 'Tubularian Hydroids,'" 244
- "Almsgiver, The Confessions of an Old," 538
- Andersen, H. C. "Reiseskizzen und Federzeichnungen," 536
- Auerbach, Berthold, "B. De Spinoza's sämtliche Werke," aus dem Lateinischen, von, 512
- "Zur guten Stunden," 588
- BAER, Dr., "Die Gefängnisse: ihre Einrichtung und Wirkung in hygienischer Beziehung," 552
- Baily, Walter, "Proportional Representation in Large Constituencies," 524
- Ballantyne, James, "Lilias Lee and other Poems," 286
- "Bantam, Lord," 572
- Bateman, Frederick, M.D., "on Aphasia, or Loss of Speech," 255
- Belief, the Development of, 121—163.  
The present outcry against Psychological Analysis, 122; an account of the Phenomena of Belief repugnant to the common mind, 122; Belief, a highly composite state of mind, 123  
Hume on Belief, 123; does Belief resemble a sensation or an idea? 124  
James Mill on Belief, 124; Bain, on, 124, 125; quotation from, 125; how is Belief resolvable into activity? 126; Professor Bain's view examined, 126, 127; examination of cases, 127; Belief not reducible to any form of activity, 128; the conditions by which the direction and intensity of Belief are determined, 129; development of the Intellectual conditions of Belief, 130; effects of Experience on Belief, 130; illustrations of, 131; M. Taine's views, 132; examination of his theory, 133; expectation and memory, 134; the case of a child, 135; Belief, an ultimate phenomenon of the mind, 136; influences, 137; influence of the general culture of the mind in transforming our first crude beliefs, 137; ideas, 138; quasi-recollections, 139; the case of unfounded anticipations, 140; Mr. Bagehot's views, 141; subjected ideas, 142; the Nominalist theory, 143; other processes examined, 144; belief in magic omens, &c., 144; influence of feeling in Belief, 145; Mr. Bagehot on the emotional character of Belief, 145, 146, (foot-note); the effect of emotion, 146; illustrations, 146, 147; further illustrations, 148; other aspects of this influence of emotion, 149, 150; temperament, 151; cases in point, 151, 152; inclination of minds towards authority or otherwise, 152, 153; towards self-reliance, 154; the case of the scientific mind, 155; various feelings which occupy a sway on all cultivated minds, 155, 156; first group,
- [Vol. XCVII. No. CXCI.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. XLI. No. II. R R

- 156; the effects upon metaphysical writers, 157; the emotional craving for the semblance of unity seen in German literature, 158; other varieties of emotional influences, 158, 159; strong emotion of respect, which gathers about the idea of experience, 160; the way in which it acts, 161; its positive working, 162; the action of will on belief, 162; summary, 163
- Bentham, Jeremy, "Theory of Legislation," by, translated from the French of Etienne Dumont, By A. Heldreth, 235
- Bergius, Carl J., "Grundsätze der Finanzwissenschaft mit besonderer Beziehung auf den Preussischen Staat," 535
- Besanez, Dr., E. F. v. Gorup, "Lehrbuch der Chemie," 539
- "Bewick's Select Fables," 596
- Bischof, Gustav, "Lehrbuch der Chemischen und Physikalischen Geologie," 553
- Bisset, Andrew, "Essays on Historical Truth," 216
- Blackburn, Mrs. Hugh, "The Pipsits," 582
- Blackie, Professor John Stuart, "Four Phases of Morals: Socrates, Aristotle, Christianity, Utilitarianism," 514
- Bogulaski, G. von, "Entwurf einer astronomischen Theorie der Meteore," von J. V. Schiaparelli, herausgegeben, von, 24
- Boston Lectures, 1870, "Christianity and Scepticism," 507
- 1871, 507
- Bothmer, Countess von, "Cruel as the Grave," 573
- Bowring, L., C.S.I., "Eastern Experiences," 266
- "Brand's, Sebastian, Narrenschiff in neuhochdeutscher Uebersetzung," von Karl Simrock, 593
- Braun, T. S., "Erna; oder Ich habe gelebt und geliebet, Ein Seelengemälde" 589
- Bray, Charles, "A Manual of Anthropology, or Science of Man, based on Modern Research," 245
- Brown, Raudon, "Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts relating to English Affairs, existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, &c.," Edited by, 262
- Brunner, Dr. H., "Die Entstehung der Schwurgerichte," 534
- Bryce, James, F.R.G.S., "The Student's Atlas of Physical Geography," 544
- Bund, Professor J. W. Willis, M.A., "The Ancient Land Settlement of England," 225
- Brunier, Ludwig, "Eine Mecklenburg Fürstentochter," 571
- Burgess, Rev. E., A.M., "What is Truth?" 512
- Burke, S. H., "The Men and Women of the English Reformation," 570
- Butler, Rev. G., "The Public School Atlas of Modern Geography," 543
- "CÆSAR in Britain," 587
- Caird, Rev. John D.D., "Christian Manliness," 220
- Call, W. M. W., "Golden Histories," 280
- Camden, Charles, "When I was Young," 581
- Carroll, W. G., M.A., "The Collapse of Faith," Edited by, 220
- "Cassell's History of the War between France and Germany," 563
- Chapman, John, M.D., Cases of Diarrhoea and Cholera treated chiefly by means of the Spinal Icebag," 251
- Chesson, F. W., "The Princes of India. Their Rights and Our Duties," 527
- "Children's Journey, The," 581
- Christian Theology and Modern Scepticism, 380—396; The *Times* on, 380; sceptics, 381; their general character and tone, 381; the *Times* regards Scepticism as a joke, 382; the Redemption Scheme stated, 382, 383; comments on, 383; the rejoinder of Christians, 384; faith, 385; what is faith? 366; other positions held by theologians, 387; that evil is a secondary form or cause of good in the lands of the Creator, 387; arguments of the *Times*' reviewer, 388; the five great religions, 389; their relative values, 390, 391; "the damned intellect, the natural enemy of priesthood," 391, 392; "the evidences of Christianity," 392, 393; miracles, 393; false faiths permitted, 393; the Gospels, 394; questions concerning, 394; the Old Testament, 395, 396; the Duke of Somerset's book, 396; criticism on, 397; its contents, 397, 398; its great value, 398
- "Christianity, the Rationale of," 507
- "Childe Malverne," 586
- "Cobden Club Essays," Second Series, 519
- Colenzo, Right Rev. J. W., "The New Bible Commentary by Bishops and

- other Clergy of the Anglican Church," critically examined by, 212
- of Joshua, critically examined," 494
- Collingwood, C., M.A., "A Vision of Creation" 587
- Collins, Clifton, W., M.A., "Sophocles," Edited by, 288
- Colomb, Colonel, "Donnington Castle," 284
- "Constable's Educational Series," 541
- Cox, Homersham, "The Session of 1871: an Epitome of its Labours and Results," 525
- Crossby, Allen James, B.A., "Calendar of State Papers of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1566—1568," Edited by, 568
- Crossland, Mrs. Newton, "The Diamond Wedding and other Poems," 285
- Cupples, Mrs. George, "Tappy's Chicks," 582
- DEANS, JOSEPH, "A Defence of Revealed Religion," 220
- Deschanel, A. Privat, "Elementary Treatise on Natural Philosophy," translated and edited by J. D. Everett, 542
- "Dictionary, the Library, of the English Language, Etymological, Explanatory, &c.," 577
- Diplomate, un ancien, en Orient, "Les Grecs à toutes les Epoque," 272
- Disraeli, Right Honourable B., "Lord George Bentinck," 570
- Dobbs, Archibald, E., M.A., "General Representation, or a Complete Readjustment and Modification of Mr. Hare's Plan," 221
- The same, second edition, 525
- Dobney, Rev. H. H., "Free Churches: a Tract for my own Congregation," 507
- Dods, Rev. M., M.A., "The City of God," translated by, 216
- Doherty, Hugh, M.D., "Organic Philosophy," vol. iii., 219
- Döllinger, John J. Ign. von, "Fables respecting the Popes of the Middle Ages," 502
- Dooney, Sarah, "Psalms of Life," 286
- Drop, H. A., M.A., "Proportional Representation as applied to the Election of Local Governing Bodies," 524
- Duncan, J. Matthews, M.D., "Fecundity, Fertility, Sterility," 254
- Dupré, Auguste, Ph.D., "A Treatise on the Nature, Origin, and Varieties of Wine," by, and J. L. W. Thudichum, M.D., 544
- EASTLAKE, CHARLES, F.R.I., B.A., "A History of the Gothic Revival," 599
- Eberly, Dr. Felix, "Walter Scott, ein Lebensbild," 562
- "Ecce Episcopus, the Bishop of Souls and his Church," 506
- Edleston, R., "The Immortal Fountains, or the Travels of Sisters to the Fountains of Beauty," 221
- Education Act, Governments and the, 164—183; the Nonconformists and Mr. Gladstone, 164; Mr. Forster, 165; the National Education League, 165; how and why the Nonconformists feel aggrieved with Mr. Forster's Acts, 165, 166; the Education League and Compulsory Education, 166; Mr. Dixon's coming motion, 166; analysis of the objections combined in Mr. Dixon's motion, 167; specimen of opposition in rural districts, 167, 168; opposition elsewhere, 168; the other objections in Mr. Dixon's motion considered, 169; the 25th clause of the Act, 170; memorial concerning, addressed to the London School Board, by a number of working men, 170, 171; religious teaching, 171; further objections considered, 172, 173; prejudicial working of the 25th clause, 173; its real character discovered, 173; correspondence with the Education Department regarding Clauses 74 and 25, 174, 175; further complaints, 176; further objections of the Nonconformists, 177; meeting of Nonconformists at the Cannon-St. Hotel, 178; excuses offered by the advocates of Clause 25, 179; argument in favour of the payment of fees for destitute children, 180; position of the Nonconformists, 181; reply of the Nonconformists to the argument that valuable time may be saved by making use of the existing schools under Clause 25, 182; Mr. Gladstone's position and duty in the present crisis, 183
- "Elder, John, Memoir of," by W. J. H. Rankine, 570
- Elder, Dr. William, "Questions of the Day, Economic and Social," 223
- Eliot, George, "Middlemarch: a Story of Provincial Life," 276
- "Wise, Witty and Tender Sayings, &c.," edited by A. Main, 571



- Elliot, James, "Moses and Modern Science," 554
- Elze, Karl, "Lord Byron: a Biography, with a Critical Essay on his place in Literature," 561
- "Entomology, Curiosities of," 243
- Euripides, Greek Tragedy and, 1—27; the mimetic theory of the drama, 1; the Greek and Hindhu drama, 1; Mysteries, 2; two conditions necessary for the drama, 2; how fulfilled in the case of the English drama, 2, 3; that of the Spanish, 3; French, Italian, German, 3; a Greek audience, 4; position in Athens of the actor and playwright, 4; condition of the Greek people at the epoch of the drama, 4, 5; destiny as seen in the Greek drama, 5, 6; more properly described as Nemesis, 6; as seen in Homer, the Cyclic, and the Gnostic poets, 6; in *Æschylus*, Sophocles, and Euripides, 7; the position of Euripides, 8; his times, 8: contrasted with those of *Æschylus*, 9; the *Æschylean* drama, 9, 10; change effected by Euripides, 10; his treatment of human life, 10; his other innovations, 10; his treatment of the Gods, 11; of human beings, 12; his descriptive passages, 12; his prologue, 12; the successive phases of art in the drama, 13; in sculpture, architecture, painting, 14; the art of Euripides in detail, 15; his beauties, 16; his ethics, 16; his *ἔμφυξία*, 16; quotation from the "*Phœnissæ*," 17; another quotation from, 18; from the "*Hecuba*," 18, 19, 20; other illustrations of *ἔμφυξία*, 20; the "*Medea*," 21; analysis of, 21, 22; translation from, 22, 23, 24; the "*Hippolytus*," 24; translations from, 24, 25; unjust criticism on Euripides, 26; general estimate of, 26, 27
- Ewald, H., "The History of Israel," by, edited by J. Estlin Carpenter, 206
- Ezion, "The Dogma, or which is Faith," 500
- FIEDLER, Dr. WILHELM, "Die Darstellende Geometrie. Ein Grundriss für Vorlesungen an technischen Hochschulen und zum Selbststudium," 238
- Field, Kate, "Pen Photographs of Charles Dickens's Readings," 287
- Fittig, Dr. Rudolph, "Wöhler's Grundriss der Organischen Chemie," 540
- Fothergill, J. Milner, "Digitalis: its mode of action and its use," 255
- Fowler, R., M.D., "History of the Welsh Fasting Girl," &c., 256
- Fox, Wilson, M.D., "On the Treatment of Hyperpyrexia," 251
- France, The Question of Race in, 434—460: variety of scenery in France, 434; differences of moral and physical characteristics amongst Frenchmen, 434; ethnic elements, 435; average stature, 436, 437; MM. Broca and Boudin on, 437; craniology, 438; language, 438; Max Müller's theory on the Roman language, 439; the theories of M. Fuchs and M. Littré, 439; historical considerations, 440; M. Thierry's classification of the races of ancient Gaul, 441; criticisms on, 442, 443; M. Thierry's "*Kymry*," 444; physical characteristics of the Gauls, 445; M. Edward's anthropological studies, 446, 447; results to be obtained from the military returns, 448; soil and geological conditions, 449; difficulties, which encounter any explanation, 450; stature, 451; in Normandy, 450; length of life, 452; complexion, 453; type of skull, 453, 454; low stature in the three districts of the south-western zone, 454, 455; Lower Brittany, 456; further remarks on the population of the south-western zone, 456, 457; the "*Escuara*," 457; consideration from an examination of Parisian and other skulls, 458 (footnote); the small brown type in France, 459; quotation from M. de Belloguet, 459; general conclusions and summing up, 460
- Freeman, Edward A., M.A., D.C.L., "Historical Essays," 269
- Frère, Sir Bartle, "The Works of John Hookham Frère," 271
- Frey, Dr. H., "Das Microscop und die Microscopische Technik," 543
- "Friends and Acquaintances," 273
- "GALLERY, the Picture," for January and February, 1872, 596
- Geiger, P. Ed. Ephr. "Der Psalter Salomo's," herausgegeben und erklärt von, 505
- Genala, Avv F. "Della Libertà ed Equivalenza dei Suffragi nelle Elezione ovvero della Proporzionale Rappresentanza della Maggioranze e Minoranze," 525
- Geographical Distribution of Animals and Plants, Geologically considered, 28—49; the purposes of this paper,

- 29; the history of geology, 29; the benefits of zoology to geology, 30; of geology to zoology, 30; lowly organised plants and their distribution, 31; instances of lichens, 31; Gauroids in the Primary Epoch, 31, 32; their present number, 32; Marsupials in the Secondary Epoch, 32; in Australia, 32; instances of shells, 32; the Tertiary fauna, 33; the Tertiary flora, 33; oak, fig, myrtle, &c., in the cretaceous deposits at Aix-la-Chapelle 34; the Miocene period, 34; fossil plants of, 35; their present analogues, 35; the fossil Miocene flora of Iceland, 36; the *Saltisburia* in a fossil state in North America, 37; the Pliocene period, 37; European fauna before the Glacial Epoch, 38; the Glacial period, 38; the "Northern Drift," 39; conclusions from the presence of seals in Lake Baikal and the Caspian Sea, 40; date of the Glacial period, 40; its duration, 40; Post-Glacial Epoch, 41; the common flora of Europe, 42; other changes, 43; deep and shallow seas, conclusions drawn from their presence, 42, 44; illustrations, 44, 45; the case of Bali and Lombok, 45, 46; the Palestine Lakes, 46; South Africa, 46; South America, 47; fossil remains of the camel in India, 47; living fauna and flora of South America, 48; its monkeys, 48; the general arboreal character of its mammals and birds, 48; Dr. Scater's and Edward Forbes's labours, 49; Dr. Scater's six principal regions for the distribution of birds, 49; conclusion, 49
- Germany, The Political Reconstruction of 324—345; the purpose of the article, 324; French theory on the German character, 325; other theories, 325; historical causes which have operated on the destinies of Germany, 326; physical causes, 326, 327; Bundesstaat and Staatenbund, 327; the differences which encountered Bismarck and Washington, 328; how Bismarck overcame the difficulties, 329; military and diplomatic reconstruction, 329; analysis of, 329, 330; three organs of government, 331; nature and constitution of the executive government, 332; the Reichstag, 333, 334; the constitution of 1870, 334; character of the alterations, 335; other alterations and changes, 336, 337; complaints of the old school of German patriots, 337, 338; principal features of the constitution of the German Empire, 339; its future development, 340; how far German political opinion is capable of permanent self-organization, 341; no political class between the monarch and the people, 342; various parties, 342; the clerical party, 343; events which might ensue from a disruption of the National Liberal party, 344; the future of Germany, 344, 345.
- Gloucester and Bristol, the Bishop of, "Modern Scepticism," A Course of Lectures, 204
- Godin, M. "Solutions Sociales," 532
- Gotthelf, Jeremias, "Aus dem Bernerland," 594
- Gould, Rev. S. Baring, "Legends of Old Testament, from the Talmud and other Sources," 513
- Gower, Matthew of, "The Wanderings of Aletes and other Poems," by, 587
- Graesse, Théodore, "Guide de l'Amateur d' Objets d' Art et de Curiosité," 595
- Graetz, Dr. H., "Schir Ha-Schirim, oder das Salomonische Hohelied," übersetzt und kritisch erläutert, 506
- Gribble, Thomas, "The Semi-barbarous Hebrew, and the Extinguished Theologian," 207
- "Griseldis." A Drama Translated from the German of Fr. Halun, by W. M. Sieg, 587
- Grundy, Charles C., "Notes on the Food of Plants," 245
- Guizot, M., "Christianity Viewed in Relation to the present state of Society and Opinion, 215
- "The History of France from the Earliest Times to 1789," 260
- HADDON, A. W., B. D., Council and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland," Edited by, and W. Stubbs, M. A., 270
- Harcourt, Capt. A. F. P., "The Himalayan Districts of Koolou, Lashoul and Spiti," 267
- Hammond, C. E., M. A., "Outlines of Textual Criticism, applied to the New Testament," 501
- Hartwig, Dr. G., "The Subterranean World," 242
- Harris, Sir W. Snow, "Rudimentary Magnetism," 542
- Harvey, R. Cadzow, "Poems," 285
- Harting, J. E. "Ornithology of Shakspeare," 556

- Hattendorf, K., "Einleitung in die Analytische Geometrie," 546
- Haupt, Erich, "Die alt testamentlichen Citate in den vier Evangelien," Erörtert von, 505
- Hawthorn Nathaniel, "Passages from the French and Italian Note-books" of, 230
- Hately, W., "Hymns of Life, for Human Encouragement," Edited by H. W. Smith, and the Music selected and arranged by, 586
- Henslow, Rev. G., M.A., "Genesis and Geology. A Plea for the Doctrine of Evolution," 220
- Hettner, Hermann, "Geschichte der Englischen Literatur, von der Weiderherstellung des Königthums bis in die Zweite Hälfte des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts," 559
- Higginson, Edward, "Ecce Messias, or the Hebrew Messianic Hope and the Christian Reality," 207
- Hinton, James "Man and his Dwelling Place. An Essay towards the Interpretation of Nature," 517
- Hope, Ascott R., "Master John Bull," 287
- Horne, R. H., "Orion." An Epic Poem, 582
- Hotten, John Camden, "Literary Copyright. Seven Letters addressed by permission to the Right Hon. the Earl of Stanhope, D.C.L. LL.D. F.R.S." 236
- Hurst, Rev. John, M.A. "Religious Thought in England from the Reformation to the end of the last Century," 205
- INDIA; The Musalman Panic, 359—380; Dr. Hunter's "Wahabees," 359; Dr. Hunter's "The Annals of Rural Bengal," 359; Dr. Hunter and the Indian Musalman, 360; his description of Syed Ahmad, 360; mistakes concerning, 361; Sithana, 362; Runjeet Sing, 363; Sir Sydney Cotton's expedition against Sithana, 364; the "Army of the Crescent," 365; the *Spectator's* commentary on Dr. Hunter's book, 365, the Indian Mahomaddans, 367; the *Pioneer* on Dr. Hunter's book, 368 (footnote); difference in the religious faith of the Wahabee and the Indian Musalman, 369; Dr. Hunter's account, 370, 371; the *Pioneer* on Dr. Hunter's theology, 372, (and footnote); Fativas, 373; Dr. Hunter's exaggeration, 374; Guzar Khan, 376; Musalman charges against the English, 376; Dr. Hunter imposed upon, 376; the Bengal Musalman, 377; Dr. Hunter on the misappropriation by the English Government of Muhammedan endowments, 378; the *Times* special correspondent in India, 379; his inability to form a correct opinion on any Indian question, 379; Lord Mayo's assassination, 379; comments on, 380
- "Intelligencer, The Colonial," 232.
- JACKSON, J. W. "Man, contemplated Physically, Moral y, Intellectually, and Spiritually," 245.
- Jacob, Major-General Sir George Le Grand, K.C.S.L., C.B., "Western India, Before and during the Mutinies," 267.
- Jennings, G., "A Book of Parliamentary Anecdotes," by, and W. T. Johnstone, 571.
- Jevons, Shirley, M.A., "The Theory of Political Economy," 232.
- "Jewish Literature, and Modern Education, or the use and abuse of the Bible in the Schoolroom," 220
- Johnstone, W. S., *see* Jennings, G.
- Jones, Dr. Bence, "The Royal Institution. Its Founder, and its first Professors," 261
- Judge, Trial by, and Trial by Jury, 289—324; trials in the courts of law to the present moment, 289; in France, England, and Ireland, 290; the principle that a tribunal ought to be composed of the prisoner's equals, 291; Michelet on the right of secularists being tried only by ecclesiastical tribunals, 292; the principle of trial by equals, 293; arguments of the advocates of the jury system, 294; the necessity of public spirit, and a proper and zealous discharge of public duties by the public itself, and not merely by a few officials, 294; trial at Athens, 295; payment of jurors, 296; jury in India, 296; effects of the summing up of the Judge, 297; in India, 297; the question of bribery, 297, 298; packed juries, 298; Ince's letter to Archbishop Saneroff, 299; corruption in ancient times, 300, 301; English juries in the time of the Plantagenets, 301; arguments against the system of trial by jury, 302; the ordinary juror, 303; his capability for judging evidence, 304; influenced by rhetorical appeals, 306; in the case of Greek tribunals, 306; edu-

- cation and prejudice, 306; effects of prejudice in England and Ireland, 307; mental training, 308; loopholes afforded by the law, 309, 310; the position of the judge, 310; Scotch juries, 311; juries deprived of food and fire, 312; judges and the amelioration of the criminal law, 313; cases of infanticide, 314; feeling on capital punishment, 314; Crown influence, 315; dangers proceeding from a single judge, 316; Court of Chancery, 317; other dangers, 318, 319; examples, 319; cases where the Government have been unsuccessful in its attempts at tyranny, 320; where it has succeeded, 320; the tyranny of the masses, 321; election of sheriffs, 321; miscarriage of justice by juries, exemplified in different countries, 322, 323; deductions and conclusions, 323, 324.
- Julian, George W., "Speeches on Political Questions," 522.
- KALISCH, M.M., Ph.D. M.A., "A Historical and Critical Commentary on the Old Testament, with a new Translation," 495
- Kavanaugh, Morgan, "Origin of Language and Myths," 262
- Kelley, William D., M.C., "Speeches, Addresses, and Letters on Industrial and Financial Questions," 522.
- Kentish, Thomas, "Cæsar in Britain," 587
- Kenward, James, F.S.A., "Oriël, A Study in 1870," 284
- "Kingdom, the Divine, on Earth as it is in Heaven," 500
- Kingsley, Charles, "Poems," 284
- Kirby, Mary and Elizabeth, "Beautiful Birds in Far-off Lands; their Haunts and Homes," 243
- Kirke, Henry, M.A., "The First English Conquest of Canada," 264
- "Known to None. A Village Romance," 276
- "Kriegschronik, Illustrierte," 563
- "Kriege, Thaten und Phrasen in deutsch-französischen," 563
- Kügler, Franz "Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte," fünfte Auflage, bearbeitet von Dr. Wilhelm Lübke, 594
- LABOUR, The Migration of, 417—434; general meaning of the term migration, 417; condition of the English labour-market, 417; result of railways, 418; the circulation of labour, 419; the first beginning of emigration, 420; public interest in emigration, 420, 421; information on the subject of labour wanted, 422; rate of wages, 422, 423; state of labour in Lancashire and London, 423; charity, 424; competition needed, 425; the ignorance of the labourer, 425; the Poor-Law, 426; Post Office Savings Banks, 427; how the migration of labourers may be stimulated, 427; charitable societies, 428; unpopularity of immigration amongst the native labourers, 429; labour, migration, and the Poor-Law, 430; extract from the second annual report of the Poor-Law Commissioners, 431; measures to be adopted, 432; a system of labour-registration and migration, 433
- "Labour, Reports of the Bureau of Statistics, of," &c., 530
- Lamb, Charles and Mary, "Poetry for Children," edited by R. H. Shepherd, 583
- Lecky, W. E. H., M.A., "The Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland," 526
- Lee, Rev. F. G., D.C.L., "The Christian Doctrine of Prayer for the Departed," 503
- Lees, W. Nassau, "Indian Mussulmans," 288
- Lefèvre, H., "Le Jeu sur les Courses de Chevaux," 240
- Lefroy, Thomas, M.A. Q.C., "Memoir of Chief Justice Lefroy," 270
- Legg, J. Wickham, M.D., "A Treatise on Hæmophilia," 551
- A Guide to the Examination of the Urine," 551
- Leland, C. G., "Gaudeamus," from the German of Scheffel, 587
- Lever, Charles, "Lord Kilgobbin," 574
- Levin, T. W., M.A., "Six Lectures Introductory to the Philosophical Writings of Cicero," 516
- Libertà e Democrazia studi sulli Rappresentanza delle Minorita," 525
- Lieder, "Historische Volks- und Volksthümliche, des Krieges von 1870—1871," 288
- "Lilliput Legends," 581
- Locker, Frederick, "London Lyrics," 553
- Lockhart, Laurence W. M., "Fair to See," 277
- Logan, W., "Words of Comfort for Bereaved Parents," 507
- Long, George, "The Decline of the Roman Republic," 569
- Lotheissen, Ferdinand, "Literatur und Gesellschaft in Frankreich, zur Zeit der Revolution," 564

- Lubbock, Sir John, Bart., M.P., "Prehistoric Times, as illustrated by Ancient Remains, and the Manners and Customs of Modern Savages," 554
- Lübke, Dr. Wilhelm, *see* Kügler, Franz
- Lucay, Le Vicomte de, "Les Assemblées Provinciales sous Louis XVI., et les Divisions Administratives de 1789," 261
- Lynch, T. T., "Sermons for my Curates," 210
- MACAULAY, JAMES, M.A. M.D., "Across the Ferry," 530
- MacCosh, James, D.D. LL.D., "Christianity and Positivism," 218
- Macdonald, George, "The Princess and the Goblin," 581
- Macdonnell, John, M.A., "A Survey of Political Economy," 223
- Main, A., *see* Eliot, G. Maine, E.S., "Annie," 574
- Malleon, Lieut. Colonel G. B., "Recreations of a London Official," 529
- "Margaret Sonnets, The," 586
- Markham, Clements R., "First Part of the Royal Commentaries of the Yncas," 264
- Markly, William, "Elements of Law Considered with Reference to the Principles of General Jurisprudence," 236
- Marlitt, E., "The Old Maid's Secret," 573
- Masterman, J., "Half-a-Dozen Daughters," 275
- Meredith, George, "The Adventures of Harry Richmond," 274
- Meteyard, Eliza, "A Group of Englishmen (1795 to 1815), being Records of the Young Wedgewoods and their Friends," 234
- Melia, Pius, D.D., "Hints and Facts on the Origin of Man," 509
- Merrifield, Charles W., F.R.S., "Technical Arithmetic and Mensuration," 545
- Mayer, Julius, "Correggio," 591
- Micheil, Nicholas, "Famous Women and Heroes," 273
- "Sibyl of Cornwall," 283
- "Pleasure," 283
- "The Immortals," 283
- Michelet, M., "The Mountain," from the French of, 242
- Madame, "Nature: or, The Poetry of Earth and Sea," from the French of, 242
- Middleton, E. E., "The Cruise of the *Kate*," 372
- Mifflin, Lloyd, "Aldornere, a Pensylvanian Idyll," 586
- Millatzen, P., "Gedichte," 288
- Millett, Mrs. Edward, "An Australian Parsonage, or the Settler and the Savage in Western Australia," 575
- Minto, William, M.A., "A Manual of English Prose Literature," 577
- Morel, Conway, "Authority and Conscience. A Free Debate on the Tendency of Dogmatic Theology," 209
- Morgan, Rev. H. A., M.A., "The Mathematical Tripod. An Inquiry into its Influence on a Liberal Education," 545
- Mousson, Alb., Professor, "Die Physik auf Grundlage der Erfahrung," 239
- Mostyn, Sydney, "Perplexity," 574
- Murray, Rev. J. Clark, "The Higher Education of Women," 226
- NAPOLÉON the First: the Man, 399—417; M. Lanfrey's work on Napoleon, 399; its tone and character, 399; the general character of French historians and biographers, 399, 400; English and American opinions concerning Napoleon I., 401; Napoleon as a patriot and an admirer of Pauli, 402; latent tendencies, 403; siege of Toulon, 403; proclamation to the army of Italy, 404; Napoleon's conduct to Venice, 405; the treaty of Campo Formio, 405; the expedition to Egypt, 406; massacre at Jaffa, 406, 407; the death of the Duc d'Enghein, 407; the *coup d'état* of the 18th Brumaire, 408, 409; its results, 409; Napoleon's administrative ability, 410; the peace of Amiens, 411; his identification of himself with France, 412; the results of the battle of Leipzig, 413; Napoleon as a military leader, 414, 415; his cowardice and pusillanimity, 415; his treatment of Toussaint l'Ouverture, Palm, Pichergu, 416; Chateaubriand's prophecy, 416, 417
- Naville, Ernest, "La Réform Electorale en France," 524
- "La Question Electorale en Europe et en Amerique," 524
- Neale, Rev. J. M., M.A., "Lectures on Church Difficulties," 211
- Newman, Dr. Isidor, "Text-book of Skin Diseases," 253
- Newman, John Henry, "Essays, Critical and Historical," 497

- Norton, Thomas, "The Hermit, a Poem," 577
- Noyes, Thomas Herbert, M.A., "Hymns of Modern Man," 585
- Nutgall, Nathaniel, "The Raven Club Papers," Edited by, 575
- OBSERVER, Wayside, A., "The year before the battle. A record of some of the Characters and Tendencies of English Society during the Middle Decades of the Nineteenth Century," by, 226
- Overbeck, J., "Griechische Kunstmythologie," 590
- Oxenham, H. N., M.A., "Recollections of Ober-Ammergau in 1871," 510
- PALMER, E. H., M.A., "The Desert of the Exodus," 229
- W., "The Patriarch and the Tsar. The Replies of the Humble Nicon, &c., &c., against the Questions of the Boyar Simeon Streshneff," 499
- Parr, Louisa, "How it All Happened, and Other Stories," 275
- Peebles, J. M., "Seers of the Ages," 512
- "Jesus Myth, Man or God," 513
- Pember, E. H., "Tristissimæ Vitæ," 285
- Physician, a, "A Dialogue by way of Catechism, Religious, Moral and Philosophical," by, 511
- "Picture Gallery, The," for January and February, 1872, 596
- Pileur, A. le, "Wonders of the Human Body," from the French of, 246
- Plener, Dr. Ernst von, "Die Englische Fabrik-Gesetzgebung," 526
- "Pliny's Letters," edited by the Rev. A. Church, M.A., and the Rev. J. W. Brodrick, M.A., 576
- Poste, Edward, M.A., "The Elements of Roman Law by Gaius," With a Translation and Commentary, 235
- Pratt, J. H., M.A., "Scripture and Science not at Variance," 213
- "The Descent of Man in connexion with the Hypothesis of Development," 245
- Priestly, Joseph, L.L.D., "A History of the Corruptions of Christianity," 510
- QUETELET, A., "Anthropométrie, ou mesure des différentes Facultés de l'Homme," 245
- Quick, Rev. R. H., M.A., "Companion to Schiller's Wilhelm Tell," edited by, with notes, &c., by Hermann Müller-Strübing," 287
- RADCLIFFE, C. B. M.D., "Dynamics of Nerve and Muscle," 247
- Rae, W. F. "Westward by Rail. A Journey to San Francisco and Back. And a Visit to the Mormons," 227
- Rankine, W. J. H., "Memoir of John Elder, Engineer," 570
- Reid, H. G., "Past and Present, or Social and Religious Life in the North," 232
- Representation, The Distribution of, 469—493; the subject of this paper, 469; mentioned in the House of Commons, 469; lists of boroughs for purposes of comparison, with their populations, 471; inferences drawn from, 472; another list of boroughs with their populations, 472, 473; deductions and inferences from, 473; inequalities of representation in counties, 474, 475; illustrations of, 474, 475; results of, 476; the ballot, 476; representative Reform, 477; Bright on, 477, 478; the Reform Bill of 1832, 479; obstructive element in the House of Commons, 480; instances of, 481; Gladstone on the ballot, 481; household suffrage in the counties, 482; our system of distribution of seats applied to foreign countries, 483; its ridiculous aspect, 483; the landed interest represented in the House of Peers, 484; splits amongst the Liberals, 485; Chartism and the equal distribution of representation, 486; Mr. Bright at Rochdale, on representative Reform, 487; at Rochdale, 488; Bright's scheme, 488, 489; criticisms on, 490; results of an extended and free suffrage to the Conservative party, 491; the number of county electors in England, according to the latest return, 491; of borough electors, 492; equalisation of the franchise demanded, 492; the ballot and the small boroughs, 493.
- Retberg, R. von, "Dürer's Kupferstiche und Holzschnitte; ein Kritisches Verzeichniss," 593
- Reynolds, J. Russell, M.D., F.R.S. "A System of Medicine," 249
- Lectures on the Clinical Uses of Electricity," 252
- Richardson, John, "Cumberland Talk," 579
- Richter, Karl T., "Einleitung in das Studium der Volkswirtschaft," 535

- Ringer, Sydney, M.D. "A Handbook of Therapeutics," 550
- Robinson, William, "Flints, Fancies, and Facts," A Review of Sir C. Lyell's "Antiquity of Man," 245
- Roesler, Robert, "Romänische Studien, Untersuchungen zur älteren Geschichte Romaniens," 272
- Ruskin, John, L.L.D., "Fors Clavigera. Letters to the Workmen and Labourers of Great Britain," 233
- Rüstow, W., Colonel, "The War for the Rhine Frontier, 1870," 268
- SAMUELSON, JAMES, "Views of the Deity, Traditional and Scientific," 211
- Saunders, Katherine, "The Haunted Crust," 278
- Sawyer, William, "The Legend of Phyllis," 587
- Sarjant, William Lucas, "Essays of a Birmingham Manufacturer," 224
- Scheel Dr. H., von "Die Theorie der Sozialen Frage," 537
- Scheffel, J. V., *see* Leland, C.
- Schlagintweit, R. von, "Californien," 534
- Schinparelli, J. V., *see* Bogulawski, G. von
- Schorlemmer, Carl, "Lehrbuch der Kohlenstoffverbindung," 538
- "Science, Modern, and the Bible; their Position and direct Antagonism," 554
- Scrope, G. Poulett, "Volcanoes, the character of their Phenomena. Their Share in the Structure and Composition of the Surface of the Globe," &c. &c., 553
- Seudamore, W. E., M.A., "Notitia Eucharistica," 502
- Septuagenarian, "The Problem of the World and the Church," by, 214
- Shaftesbury, The First Earl of, 70—151; unpaid Literature in England and the United States, 71; birth of Shaftesbury, 71; his property, 72; at Oxford, 73; scenes there, 73; his marriage, 73, 74; his election for Tewkesbury, 74; joins the King's party, 75; joins the Parliamentary, side 76; his diary, 77; Barebones' Parliament, 77; the part which Shaftesbury played, 77; statement of the offer of the Crown to him, 78; in the next Parliament, 78; his retirement from the Council, 79; his second marriage, 79; shut out from Parliament, 79; takes his seat in 1658, 80; speech against Cromwell's peers, 81; Shaftesbury's "ratting" qualities, 82; his character, 83; the power of the army, 83; overtures made to Shaftesbury, 84, 85; feelings and condition of the army, 84, 85; Monk Commander-in-Chief, 87; return of Charles II., 88; Shaftesbury as Chancellor of the Exchequer, 89; his conduct in the House of Lords, 89; contemporary evidence regarding him, 90; his opposition to the Five Mile Act, 91; fall of Clarendon 92; the Cabal, 93; secret treaty with Louis, 94; Shaftesbury's part, 94, 95; his promotion, 95; as Lord Chancellor, 96; the No-Popery feeling in England, 97; Shaftesbury's dismissal, 99; as leader of the opposition, 100; on the Test Act, 101; committed to the Tower, 102; his conduct there, 103; his apology, 104; as President of the Council, 105; the Exclusion Bill, 105; his unpopularity at Court, 106; on the Exclusion Bill, 107; scene during the debate, 108; new Parliament at Oxford, 108, 109; Barrillon's account of a scene during the Session at Oxford, 109; impeachment of Shaftesbury, 111; Dryden's "Absalom and Achitophel," 111; Shaftesbury's victory, 112; Monmouth's rising, 113; Shaftesbury's escape, 114, 115; his death, 115; his character, 115; as described by Mr. Christie, 116; comments on, 117; general summary of, 118; Butler's view, 119; his failings, 119, 120; two anecdotes of 120, 121
- Shield, Joseph, "The Death of Lucretius," 583
- Sidgwick, A., "Scenes from Aristophanes," &c. &c., 287
- Sieg, W. M., *see* Griseldis.
- Simpson, Sir J. Y. Bart., M.D., "Selected Works" of, 249
- Anæsthesia, Hospitalism, &c., 249
- "The Diseases of Women," 457
- Simcock, Karl, *see* Brand
- Skeat, Rev. W. W., "The Gospel according to St. Mark, in Anglo Saxon and No-thumbrian Versions synoptically arranged," 504
- Smith, W. Watman, "Village Life and Sketches, with other Poems," 587
- Somers, Robert, "The Southern States since the War," 521
- Sonnenschein, A., "School Boards and Board Schools," 538
- Spiritualism and its Evidences, 461—468; Mr. Bright's conversation, 461; the purport of the book on Spiritualism by M.P., 461; antecedent credibility of spiritual manifestations, 462; evidence

- from the Bible, 463 ; strong *à priori* argument in favour of these spiritual phenomena, 464, 465 ; quotations from M. P., 464, 465 ; Mr. Home flying about in the air, 466 ; Mr. E. L. Blanchard, the well-known author, flying about in the air, 466 ; no martyrs yet for spiritualism, 467 ; some objections refuted by M. P., 468 ; what is the meaning of the book by M. P. ? , 468
- Stahr, A., "Weimar and Jena," 589  
 ——— "Kleine Schriften," 589
- Stewart, T. G., M.D., "Bright's Diseases of the Kidneys, 254
- Stormonth, Rev. J., "Ethnological and Pronouncing Dictionary," 236
- Strange, Thomas Lumsden, "The Speaker's Commentary," 212
- "Surgical Cases, A Report of, Being Circular No. 3 of the War Department of the United States," 549
- Swedenborg, Emanuel, "On the White Horse, mentioned in the Apocalypse," 507
- Syme, David, "Landlordism in its Moral, Social, and Economic Relations," 225
- TAINE, H. A., History of English Literature, translated by H. Van Laun, 257  
 ——— "Du Suffrage Universel et de la Manière de Voter," 523  
 ——— "History of English Literature," translated by H. Van Laun, 556
- Tate, Ralph, "Rudimentary Treatise on Geology," 241
- Tennyson, Alfred, "The Works of," 583
- Thackeray, W. Makepeace, "Vanity Fair," 288
- Thomson, George, "The Discovery of a New World of Being," 517
- Thudichum, J. L. W., M.D., *see* Duprè, Auguste, Ph. D.
- "Times, Essays from the," 287
- Toman, Dr. Hu:o, "Das Böhmische Staatsrecht und die Entwicklung der Österreichischen Reichsidee von Jahre 1527 bis 1848," 536
- "Ttsoé, and Other Poems," 285
- Twiss, Sir Travers, Q.C., D.C.L., "The Black Book of the Admiralty," 568
- Tytler, Sarah, "Sisters and Wives," 573
- UEBERWEG, Dr. F., "System of Logic and History of Logical Doctrines," Translated from the German with Notes and Appendices, By Thomas M. Lindsay, M.A., 217
- VAUGHAN, C. J., D.D., "Family Prayers," 214
- WAGES, A Theory of, 184—203 ; Mr. Thornton on the Theory of supply and demand, 184 ; Turgot on, 185 ; Adam Smith on, 184, 185 ; money wages, and real wages, 185 ; Mr. Thornton's denial of the wage-fund, 186 ; Mr. Francis D. Longe's pamphlet, 186, (foot-note) ; a case put in illustration, 186, 187 ; the problem stated, 187 ; a case in Australia, 188 ; in Germany, 188, 189 ; the case of the Dorsetshire labourer, 189 ; of the Yorkshire labourer, 190 ; explanation of the difference, 191 ; means of raising wages, 192, 193 ; limitations, 193 ; effect of the Corn Laws, 194 ; English and American wages compared, 195 ; the labourer's condition in France, 196 ; variation of wages depending on efficiency of labour, 197 ; Senior and Cairnes on, 198 ; "labour the real measure of the exchangeable value of all commodities," 199 ; Ricardo's argument examined, 199 ; cheap labour, its meaning, 200 ; the case of Demerara, 200 ; Mr. Merri- vale's views examined, 200, 201 ; Malthus and his followers, 201 ; examination of his doctrine, 202 ; effect of the Black Death, 203 ; general summary, 203
- Wales, the University College, of, 345—358 ; necessity of a university in Wales, 345 ; the use of Universities, 346 ; Scotch universities, 346 ; their benefit to Scotland, 347 ; Irish colleges, 348, 349 ; educational establishments in Wales, 349 ; education in Wales and in Germany, 349, 350 ; compared with that of our Colonies, 350 ; the Queen's Colleges in Ireland, 350, 351 ; Welsh university to be opened at Aberystwyth, 351 ; subscriptions for, 352 ; causes which have retarded the progress of the Welsh university, 352 ; the isolation and poverty of the people, 352, 353 ; religious differences, 353 ; arguments against the establishment of a university, 354 ; the results of English and Scotch universities contrasted, 355 ; prospects of the Welsh university, 356, 357 ; money collected and expended, 356, 357 ; money still required, 358
- Wellington, Field Marshal Arthur, Duke of, "Despatches, Correspondence, Memoranda of," Edited by



- his Son, the Duke of Wellington, 569
- West, Charles, M.D., "on Some Disorders of the Nervous System in Childhood," 250
- White, R., "History of the Battle of Banockburn," 567
- Wickede, Julius von, "Geschichte des Krieges von Deutschland gegen Frankreich, in den Jahren 1870 und 1871," 268
- Williams, C. J. B., M.D. F.R.S., "Pulmonary Consumption," by, and C. T. Williams, M.D., 247
- Wilson, Benjamin, "Sister Martha: or a Romance of the Franco-Prussian War," 575
- Wilson, Forbes, M.D., "Flowers and Gardens," 580
- Wilson, George, M.D., "Inorganic Chemistry," Revised and Enlarged by H. G. Madan, M.A., 540
- Women, the Political Disabilities of, 50—70; triumphs of the principles of popular government, 51; the enfranchisement of women, 51; the complaints of women, 51, 52; theory of the present system of enfranchisement, 52; how it practically works, 52; its effect upon women, 52; the political position of women, 53; how the crime of womanhood is punished, 53; how woman is by the law regarded as worse than a criminal, 54; as more than a lunatic, 54; how Mr. Justice Byles has reduced her political rights to those of the domestic animals, 54; how a revising barrister struck out all persons, who bore such names as Mary, Hannah, &c., 54; if a man, however, was called Ponto or Dobbin this barrister would still allow him a vote, 55; results of such a system, 55; the Attorney-General's appeal to women in his speech on the Bill for legalizing marriage with a deceased wife's sister, 56; tenour of the debates on the Married Women's Property Bill, 57; how the Act of 1870 operates, 57; a case in point, 57, 58; relations between man and wife, 58; in the case of the labouring man and his wife, 59; Mr. J. G. Shaw Lefevre's proposed Bill in 1869, 59; the question of maintenance, 60; the wife of the working man, 60, 61; examples, 61; other instances, 62; the question of the custody of children, 62, 63; painful case in the Irish Court of Queen's Bench, 63, 64; injustice of the law, 64; cases and decisions quoted by Mr. Macpherson, 65, 66, 67; various propositions illustrated by these cases and decisions, 67; Professor Huxley on our Savages in Liverpool, 68; extracts from Mr. Justice Brett's charge to the Grand Jury at the winter assizes at Manchester, 68, 69; the woman question associated with general progress, 69, 70.
- Wood, Rev. J. G., M.A., "Insects at Home, being a popular account of British Insects, their Structure, Habits and Transformation," 243
- YOUNGE, C. D., Professor, "Three Centuries of English Literature," 561
- ZERFFI, Professor, Ph. D., "Spiritualism and Animal magnetism," 256
- Zincke, F. Barham, "Egypt of the Pharaohs and the Khedive," 567
- Zingerle, Ignaz von, "Sitten, Bräuche, und Meinungen des Tiroler Volkes," 537





